ΡΟΜΦΑΙΑ

Δίστομος Ὀξεῖα

OR

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

DEFENDED

In two treatiſes againſt the Fabulous and Slanderous Imputations caſt upon her in thoſe two Points.

OF { Succeſſion of Biſhops and Schiſme

Wherein

The Fable of the Nags-head Ordination is detected,

And

The Accuſation of Schiſme retorted.

By *John Bramhall* D. D. Biſhop of *Derry*

Pſal. 56. 5.

Filii hominum, dentes eorum arma & ſagittæ: & lingua eorum gladius acutus.

Ψαλ. 55. 15.

Ἡ ῥομφαία αὐτῶν εἰσέλθοι εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν.

Printed at the *Hague*, and Publiſhed at *London*, 1658.

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER.

THis Book runs the Fate which others ſeldome meet with in ſeme reſpects, whereof one is, that it is Printed in one place, and Publiſhed in another: And though this be a thing which would not need any Preface, yet ſome other things there be that will, which the Reverned Author, having referred to the Publiſher, to give an accompt of to the Reader; he may be pleaſed to receive in this folowing Advertiſement.

The Book was both Written and Printed beyond Sea; But the Materialls upon which a good part of the former Treatiſe conſiſteth, were ſuch, as no place but

England *could afford, being either matter of* Testimony *from Persons of Honour, and others that live here; or of* Record *in our Publick Offices and Registeries; Which being then a gathering while the Authors Pen was a writing, and the Printers hand a working, made them come sometimes more slowly than otherwise had been requisite.*

I may instance in that Honourable Attestation *given by the* Lords Temporal *to the* Bishop *of* Duresmes Protestation; *and by it to the cause it self.* (*Printed here*, chap. 2. p. 22, 23.) *which hath been subscribed already, by* fifteen *Lords, most of them of the prime Nobility, though no more than* nine *of them are named in that place, because no more than those nine had then subscribed it, when that sheet was Printed off. It hath alwaies been the Honour of the Nobility to Protect the Church, defend the Truth, and relieve those that are wronged: And God forbid that any of these Noble Persons, that have so freely and readily concurred in all these*

by

by this Atteſtation, *ſhould want the return of that acknowledgement which is juſtly due to them for it. Let the Reader therefore take notice that of theſe* fifteen, *two of them are the* Marqueſſes *of* Hartford, *and* Dorcheſter: *Eleven of them are* Earls, *viz. The Earl of* Lyndſey, *Lord high Chamberlain of* England; *together with the Earls of* Rutland, Southampton, Lincoln, Devonſhire, Mancheſter, Berkſhire, Cleveland, Monmouth, Dover, *and* Newport: *and the other two are* Barons *viz. the Lord* Willoughby *of* Parham, *and the Lord* Lovelaces.

For the other Atteſtation *from the* Lords Spiritual, *there needed no more to be ſaid than what is in the Book; if the Printer had not careleſly left out three of their Chriſtian-names; which being uſually prefixed to their Titles in the ſubſcription of* Biſhops *(though not alwaies of temporall Lords) may perhaps afford our Adverſaries a new occaſion of quarelling for ſuch an omiſſion; now that all materiall exceptions are ſo ab-*

ſolutely cut off from them for ever. To prevent this, be it known to them, that it is ſubſcribed by William *Biſhop of* London (*who was then Lord high Treaſurer of* England) William *Biſhop of* Bath *and* Wells, Matthew *Biſhop of* Elie (*then Dean of his Majeſties Chapell-Royall*) Robert *Biſhop of* Oxford, John *Biſhop of* Rocheſter, *and* Bryan *Biſhop of* Sarisbury (*then Tutour to his highneſs the Prince of* Wales,) *all of them perſons of much worth, great integrity, and reveren'd Eſtimation; and therefore not onely likely to know, but unlikely to deny, if there had been any ſuch paſſage in that Parliaments.*

Beſide theſe, there is a third Atteſtation *likewiſe annexed to the Biſhop of* Dureſmes Proteſtation, *from the* Clerk *of the Parliament and his two* Aſſiſtents; *who attended in the Houſe continually, to obſerve and record whatſoever was there debated: and therefore could not be ignorant of ſuch a paſſage as this is pretended to be, if any ſuch had really been. The reverend Author*

thought

thought not fitting to print it, though he had a true Copy of it, becauſe it was not then ſubſcribed, by reaſon of the abſence from this place of ſome of the ſubſcribers: But to ſupply that defect, the Reader may now have it in theſe following words.

We whoſe Names are hereunto ſubſcribed, being Clerks in the Honourable Houſe of Peer's, during the Parliament begun at Weſtminſter *the third day of* Nov. 1640. *whole according to our ſeverall places & offices, did give continuall attendance in the ſaid Houſe; and as our duty required did reſpectively, and particularly obſerve whatſoever was debated and concluded in it: Do hereby teſtifie and declare, that to the beſt of our knowledge and remembrance, no ſuch* Book *was preſented to that Honourable* Houſe: *nor ſuch* Speech *made in it, by the Reveren'd Biſhop of* Dureſme, *or any other, as are mentioned and diſavowed in his Lordſhips* Proteſtation *and declaration here perfixed. And therefore*

we

we have freely aud voluntarily given this our Atteſtation for the confirmation of the truth, of what is affirmed and declared by the ſaid Biſhop in his ſaid Proteſtation. In witneſs whereof, we have hereunto ſet our hands: Dated the 27 *day of* December, Anno Dom. 1658.

Jo. Brown *Cleric. Parliamentorum.*
Jo. Throckmorton.
Sam. Smith.

What can our Adverſaries ſay to this? If they ſuſpect the memory of all theſe Clerks, they may be ſatisfied by Mr. Scobells *Certificate out of the Journall of the Houſe (here Printed,* p. 23.*) If they ſay ſuch a thing there was, though it be not recorded, they may be ſilenced by the contrary practiſe of the Houſe; together with the Teſtimony of all theſe ſworn Officers, & the Memorialls of ſome of them in* Scriptis, *out of which the Journall of the Houſe was daily completed.*

Whereunto

Whereunto may be added that the Bi-ſhops *who ſubſcribed that* Atteſtation *(being ſo nearly concerned at that time) were ſo diligent in the Houſe, as that for inſtance, one of them was abſent but one day; another but two, while they ſate in Parliament; and the reſt as ſeldome as their other weighty occaſion would permit: And ſome of them have their own private memorials ſtill by them of all that paſſed, and therefore gave no blind teſtimony to what they here ſubſcribed.*

In brief, the untruth is ſo palpable, that the perſon, who was the Inſtrument in gathering almoſt all theſe ſubſcriptions, will depoſe it upon oath, if need require, that he never uſed any ſollicitation, or perſwaſion to any perſon, (whether Lord, *or* Biſhop, *or* Clerk) *to ſubſcribe, but onely propoſed it to their conſideration, and that thereupon they did all willingly ſubſcribe it (as many as he proferred it to) and with very great deteſtation of that notorious ſtander which firſt occaſioned it.*

We

We may therefore very reasonably presume, that most of the temporal Lords, *who then Sate in Parliament, would most willingly have attested this manifest truth, if the thing could with any convenience have been represented to them. But seeing they live so dispersedly all over* England, *and withall that so many of them have subscribed as (with the* Bishops *and* Clarks) *will make up the number of a double Jury, it was thought neither necessary nor convenient to be at any further trouble in this business, which had already been proved in such a superabundant measure; but onely to lodge the* Protestation *with the* Attestations *annexed in some* Authentick Registery, *where they may stand upon Record as an Honourable Testimony to the succession of Bishops in the English Church, and a perpetuall brand of infamy to the Inventours and Abettours of this impudent Slander.*

That this is no vain presumption will further appear in that other Lords *also (and those of different perswasions) who have*

have not seen the Originals of these Testimonials, but onely were made acquainted with them, have notwithstanding utterly disclaimed what our Adversaries pretend, some in Words, *and some in* Writing.

One instance of the former is the Lord Brudnall, *an eminent Roman Catholick, but a person of more conscience and honour than to defend their cause by such indirect courses: and therefore fearing lest any should suspect him to be that* Antient Peer *(mentioned in this Book. p. 9.) because he is now the Antientest man of any Peer of* England, *he utterly disclaimed his knowledge of any such passage, in his discourse with Sr.* Justinian Isham *and Mr.* Francis Crawley *in* July *last at* Northampton.

Another Instance of the later we have in the Lord Say, *in his letter to a Friend, (of* Oct. 22. *last past) where he saith of that pretended Book and Speech, that he* remembers no such thing, *but* thinks it an invented tale: *Nay (more yet) that he*

he is ſure the Biſhops were indeavoured to be put out of the Houſe upon another account, and not upon that at all. *What thoughts his Lordſhip hath of* Biſhops, *is not pertinent to this queſtion: The meaner they are, the ſtronger will his teſtimony be in this cauſe. If any ſuch* Endeavours *had been* (*as* he is ſure there was none) *who more likely to have known and remembred it than he? Or who more unlikely now to diſclaim it, ſeeing he ſtill eſteems of the* order of Biſhops *as* no other than a Popiſh device.

As for matter of Record *alledged in this book, it is done with ſo much fidelity as* (*when the* Errata's *are corrected may endure the ſcanning of the moſt ſupercilious* Ariſtarchus *of the Society; onely the Reader is deſired to take notice, that in the* Regiſter *of Archbiſhop* Parker, *Tom.* 2. *fol.* 10. (*Whence the* Act upon the conſecration *is tranſcribed, which is here printed,* p. 104, 105.) *the words of the* Benediction *are recorded in* Engliſh *as they were pronounced out of the* Engliſh Ordinall, *and as Mr.* Maſon *hath*

hath Printed them, though this Reverend Author, hath put them in Latine to make the Record ſpeak all one and the ſame Language. And therefore the words, p. 105. l. 7. *are to be read thus, (to make them anſwer punctually to the Record)* Dixerunt Anglicè. Take the Holy Ghoſt, and remember that thou ſtir up the grace of God which is in thee by Impoſition of hands, For God hath not given us the Spirit of Fear, but of Power, and Love, and Soberneſs.

This Advertiſement (I confeſs) would have been ſuperfluous, if we had to deal with any Adverſarys, but ſuch as for want of material exceptions, graſp at every punctillio to caſt dirt in the face of our holy Mother the Church of Eng. *and have accordingly heretofore concluded a* variety (*and conſequently a forgery*) *of* Regiſters *from ſome ſuch trivial differences in our Authors as theſe are;* But *let them know yet once more that the* Regiſter *is but one, and that a fair, punctual, compleat, and unqueſtionable Record, as this*

Reveren'd

Reverend Author hath proved it, and as it will manifest it self to be to any one that shall look upon it, without prejudice when our adversaries have vented all their malice against it. Which the Father of Lyes *can suggest unto them.*

THE

THE CONSECRATION AND SUCCESSION,

Of Proteſtant Bishops juſtified.

The BISHOP of DURESME vindicated.

And

That infamous Fable of the ordination at the Nagges head clearly confuted.

By JOHN BRAMHALL,
D. D. Bishop of Derry.

Neceſſe eſt ut lancē in libra ponderibus impoſitis
Deprimi, ſic animum perſpicuis cedere.

GRAVENHAGH,
By JOHN RAMZEY,
Anno 1658.

CHAP. I.

The occaſion of this Treatiſe.

THe faireſt eares of Corne are ſooneſt blaſted, ſo the more conſpicuous the Church of England was among the reformed Churches, (as not being framed according to the brainſicke dictates of ſome ſeditious Oratour, or the giddy humours of a tumultuous multitude, but with mature deliberation, and the free conſent and concurrence of all the Orders of the Kingdome,) the more it was ſubjected to the envie and groundleſſ calumnies of our Countrymen of the Roman Communion: But of all the ſlanderous aſperſions caſt upon our Church, that liyng fable of the Nagges head Ordination doth beare the bell away. Thoſe monſtrous fictions of the Cretian bulles and minotaures, (deviſed by the Athenians to revenge themſelves upon Minos King of Creete, who had ſubdued them in a juſt warre, and compelled them to ſend their ſons to him for hoſtages,) were not more malicious, nor that shameleſſ lie of *K*entish long tailes more ridiculous. The firſt deviſer of it doth juſtly deſerve the Character of *A*

man of a braſen forhead and leaden hearte. I
the unpartiall reader after he have peruſe
this treatiſe, thinke I doe him wrong. I d
willingly ſubmitte my ſelf to his cenſure.
This prodigious fable received its deathe
wound from Mr. Maſons penne, an
hath remained ever ſince for the ſpace o
thirty yeares buried in deepe oblivion. An
thoſe aſſaies which it maketh now to ge
wing againe, by the aſſiſtence of two Ig
natian Fathers, are but the vaine attempt
of a dying Cauſe. Neither would I hav
troubled the Reader or my ſelf *to brin*
Owles to Athens, or to confute a Cau
which hath bene ſo demonſtratively con
futed to my hand, but for two new addi
tions lately ſpread abroad. The one by ora
tradition which concerneth my ſelf. Th
Father T. and Father B. had ſo confu
ted the Biſhop of Derry in the preſenc
of the King, that he ſaid he perceived h
Father had made me a Lord, but not
Biſhop, And that *afterwards, by m*
power I had procured thoſe two Ieſuits t
be prohibited that preſence. So that whe
reas Father Talbot uſed to be the Inter
preter in the Spaniſh treaties, now he w
not admitted, and Don Iohn would ad
mitte no other.

So the Bishop of Derry is accuſed not onely to have bene publickly baffeled, but alſo to have bene a diſturber of publick affaires. Yet I know nothing of all this, which concerneth myſelf. I never heard of any ſuch conference, or any ſuch words, I never knew that Father Talbot was deſigned to that imploiment. I was never guilty of having any ſuch power, muchleſſe of any endevour to turne out any man, if the Fathers ſeemed too pragmaticall to thoſe who were intruſted, or to involue the intereſt of their Religion into Civill treaties, what is that to me? If it were true they may thanke themſelves. If it were falſe, they may thanke them who did it. Whether true or falſe I never had an hand, nor ſo much as a little finger in it.

All the truth that I know is this. Hearing that theſe two Fathers, had ſpoken largely in the Courte of the Succeſſion of our English Bishops, but never in my preſence, I ſought out Father B, and had private conference with him about it in the Ieſuits College at Bruges, and afterwards ſome diſcourſe with Father T. and him together in mine owne Chamber. Whatsoever they did ſay, they put into writing to which I returned them an anſwer, ſhewing not onely that there

was not, but that it was morally impoſ-
ſible there should be any ſuch Ordination
at the nagges head. From that day to this
I never heard any thing of it, that concer-
ned myſelf. Now if a man should ſearch
for an Author of this fabulous Relation,
he shall be ſure to have it fathered upon
ſome very credible perſõs, without names,
who had it from Iohn an okes whileſt he
was living, and he had it from Iohn a Stiles,
and he had it from No body, but feined
it himſelf out of a good intention, accor-
ding to that caſe Theology which he had
learned of Machiavell, *To advance the credit
of Religion* by all meanes poſſible true or
falſe.

The other addition concerneth the lear-
ned and Reverend Bishop of Dureſme
one of the ancienteſt Bishops this day li-
ving in the Chriſtian world, being 95 yea-
res old at leaſt. That he owned and juſti-
fied the nagges head Ordination in publick
Parliament, in the houſe of the Peeres: It
is very well, we can not deſire a better
place where to have it ſpoken, then the
houſe of Parliament. Nor better witneſſes
then the Lords ſpirituall and temporall.
We have no man of the Epiſcopall Order,
whoſe memory can reach, ſo neare thoſe
times, or in whoſe integrity we doe more
confide

confide, then the Bishop of Dureſme. He might heare many things either from the perſons prætended to have bene then conſecrated, or from the Notaries or witneſſes who were then preſent at that imaginary Conſecration. Or at leaſt he might receive the tradition of that age from ſuch as were eiewitneſſes of what paſſed. Let it be put to his Teſtimony if they thinke fitte, (without doubt he is the ſame man he was then) or to the Teſtimony of any other of his age and Reputation, whom they can produce. We refuſe no ſort of proofe but onely vaine *hear ſay*, which as our English proverbe ſaith is commonly, and in this caſe moſt undoubtedly a lier. Nay we would not refuſe the Teſtimony of Mr. Neale himſelf, though a profeſſed enemy, who was the onely founder of this ſilly fable, ſo he might be examined upon oath, before equall Iudges, but compell him either to ſhame the divell, and eate his owne words, or to runne himſelf into ſuch palpable abſurdities Contradictions and impoſſibilities, that no man of reaſon how partiall ſoever, could give any credit to him. My firſt taske ſhall be, before I meddle with the fable it ſelf to vindicate the Biſhop of Dureſme, and the truth which is wounded through his ſydes, with this in-

timation to the Reader, that if this branch of the Legend be proved apparently to be falſe, which is pretended to have bene publickly acted in a full houſe of the Peeres of the Realme, we can expect no truth from the voluntary reporte of one ſingle meane malicious enemy, to his own party. And with all a confeſſed Spie, of what was done at the Nagges head. Breake ice in one place, and it will crack in more.

CHAPT. II.

The Vindication of the Bishop of Dureſme.

TO vindicate the Bishop of Dureſme, I shall firſt ſet downe the relation of this paſſage in the words of the Fathers themſelves.

Treatiſe of the nature of Catholick faith and hareſy c. 2. p. 9.

In the beginning of the late Parliament ſome Presbiterian Lordes preſented to the upper houſe a certeine booke, proving that the Proteſtant Bishops had no ſucceſſion or conſecration, and therefore were no Bishops and by conſequence had no right to ſitte in Parliament. Hereupon Doctor Morton pretended Bi-

shop

hop of Durrham who is yet alive, made speech against this booke in his owne nd all the Bishops behalfe then present. He endeavoured to prove succession rom the last Catholick Bishops, who (said he) by imposition of hands ordei- ned the first Protestant Bishops at the Nagges head in Cheap syde, as was No- torious to all the world. Therefore the fore said booke ought to be looked upon s a groundless libell. This was told to many by one of the ancientest Peeres of England, prasent in Parliament when Morton made his speech. And the same he is ready to depose upon his oath. Nay he cannot believe that any will be so impudent as to denie a thing so notori- ous, whereof there are as many wit- nesses living, as there are Lords and Bi- shops that were that day in the upper house of Parliament.

Here are three passages. One concer- ning a booke presented to the upper house, against the succession of English Bishops, by some presbiterian Lords.

The

The ſecond concerning the pretended re
futation of this booke by the Biſhop o
Dureſme. The third the proofe of bot
theſe allegations by the Teſtimony of a
Ancient Peere of England,

Firſt for the booke, It is moſt tru
there was a booke written about that tim
by a ſingle Lord againſt Epiſcopacy, an
dedicated to the members of both houſe
of Parliament. No wonder. How ofte
have the Parliaments in the reignes o
Queene Eliſabeth and King Iames ben
troubled with ſuch *Requeſts* and *Repreſenta
tions*. It is no ſtrange thing that a weak
eie ſhould be offended with the light of th
ſun. We may juſtly aſcribe the revivin
of the Aerian hereſy in theſe later daie
to the Diſpenſations of the Courte of Rom
who licenſed ordinary Prieſts to ordeine
and confirme, and do the moſt eſſential
offices of Biſhops. So their Scholes d
teach us, *A Preeſt may be the extraordinar
Miniſter of Prieſthood, and inferiour order
by the delegation of the Pope.* Againe *The Pop
may conferre the power of confirmation* upon
ſimple Prieſt. By ſuch exorbitant practiſe
as theſe they chalked our the way to inno
vators. And yet they are not able to pro-
duce one preſident of ſuch a diſpenſatio
throughout the primitive times. A goo
Chriſtia

Christian onght to regarde more what the whole Christian world in all ages hath practiſed, then what a few conceited perſons in this laſt age have fancied. Among all the Eaſterne Southern and Northerne Christians, who make innumerable multitudes, there neither is nor ever was one formed Church that wanted Bishops. Yet theſe are as farre from ſubmitting to the exorbitant power of the Roman Bishop as we. Among all the weſterne Churches and their Colonies, there never was one formed Church for 1500. yeares, that wanted Bishops. If there be any perſons ſo farre poſſeſſed with prejudice, that they chuſe rather to follow the private dictates of their owne phrenſy, then the perpetuall and univerſall practiſe of the Catholick Church, enter not into their ſecrets o my ſoule.

Thus farre we agree, but in all the reſt of the circumſtances, (though they be not much materiall) the Fathers do pittifully miſtake themſelves, and vary much from the Teſtimony of their witneſſ, and much more from the truth. Firſt the Authour of this booke was no preſbyterian Lord, much leſſ a company or caball of Preſbiterian Lords in the plurall, but my Lord Brookes, one that had as little favour for

preſbytery

Presbytery as for Episcopacy.

Secondly the booke was not præsented to the upper house. It might be brought into the house privately, yet not be præsented to the house publickly. If it had bene publickly præsented, the Clerkes of the Parliament or some of them must needes have known of it and made an Act of it, but they know no such thing. The Lords Spirituall and Temporall could not all have Forgotten it, but they remember no such thing, as by their respective certificates præsently shall appeare.

Thirdly as the Authour is mistaken, and præsentation mistaken. So the subject likewise is mistaken. *Sit liber Index*, let the booke speake for it self. Thus an able freind certifieth me. *I have got my Lord Brookes booke which he wrote against the Bishops with much labour, and perused it with no less Patience. And there is not in it the least shadow of any Argument, that the Bishops ought not to sitte in Parliament, because they had no succession or consecration.* What did my Lord Brookes regard succession or Consecration or holy orders, who had a Coachman to be his preacher. The less Canonicall the ordination had bene, the more he would have applauded it. Time and place and forme and all were agreeable to that Chri-

stian

ſtian liberty which he dreamed of, it was not wante of conſecration, but conſecration it ſelf which he excepted againſt, as all men knew who knew him. And in this quarrell he loſt his life, after a moſt remarkable and allmoſt miraculous manner, at the ſiege of Lichfield Church, upon St. Ceaddas anniverſary day, who was the founder of that Church and Bishop of it.

I know the Fathers will be troubled much, that this which they have published to the view of the world, concerning the Bishop of Durrham, as *a truth ſo evident which no man can have the impudence to denie*, should be denied, yea denied poſitively and throughout, denied not onely by the Bishop of Durrham himſelf, bnt by all the Lords ſpirituall and Temporall that can be met with, Denied by ſome Lords of their owne communion, who underſtand them ſelves as well as any among them, though their names are not ſubſcribed, to the certificate, Denied by the Clerkes of the Parliament, whoſe office it is to keepe a diary of all the ſpeeches made in the houſe of the Peeres For Proofe hereof Firſt I produce the Proteſtation of the Bishop of *Dureſme* him ſelf, atteſted by witneſſes in the Præſence of a publick Notary. Take it in his owne words.

Whereas

VVhereas I am most injuriously and slanderously traduced, by a nameles Authour, calling himself N. N. in a booke said to be printed at Rouen 1657. intituled [a treatise of the nature of Catholick faith and heresy], as if upon the presenting of a certein booke to the upper house in the beginning of the late Parliament, prouing as he saith the protestant Bishops had no succession nor consecration, and therefore were no Bishops, and by consequence ought not to sit in Parliament, I should make a speech against the said booke in my owne and all the Bishops behalfs, endevouring to prove succession from the last Catholick Bishops as he there stiles them,) who by imposition of hands ordeined the first protestant Bishops, at the nagges head in cheapside, as was notorious to all the world, &c.

I do hereby in the presence of Almighty God solemnely protest and declare to all the world, that what this Authour there affirmes concerning me is a most notorious untruth and a grosse slander. For to the best of my knowledge

and

nd remem brance, no ſuch booke as he here mentions was ever preſented to the pper houſe in that or any other Parlia-nent, that ever I ſate in. And if there ad, I could uever have made ſuch a peech as is there pretended, ſeeing I have ver ſpokē according to my thoughts, and lwaies believed that fable of the Nagges ead conſecration to have proceded rom the father of lies; as the Au-hentick Recordes of the Church ſtill ex tant, which were ſo faithfully tran-cribed, and published by Mr. Maſon, do vidently teſtifie. And whereas the ame impudent Libeller doth moreover ay, that what he there affirmes was told o many, by one of the ancienteſt Peeres f England, præſent in Parliament, when made this pretended ſpeech: and hat he is ready to depoſe the ſame upon is oath: And that he can not believe ny will be ſo impudent, to denie a thing o notorious, whereof there are as many itneſſes living, as there are Lords and Bishops that were that day in the upper houſe of Parliament &c. I anſwer, that

I

I am very unwilling to beleeve any peer of England should have so little sense of his Consticence and honour, as either to sweare or so much as affirme such a notorious untruth. And therefore for the justification of my self and Manifestation of the truth in this Particular, I do freely and vvillingly appeale (as he directs me) to those many honourable persons, the Lord Spirituall and temporall yet alive, vvho sate in the house of Peeres in that Parliament, or to as many of them as this my Protestation shall come to, for a true certificate of vvhat they knovv or believe Concerning this matter. Humbly desiring them and charging it upon their soules, as they vvill answver it to god at the day of Iudgment, that they vvill be pleased to testifie the truth, and nothing but the truth herein, to the best of their knovvledg and remembrance, vvithout any favour or affection to me at all. I cannot reasonably be suspected by any indifferent man, of denyng any thing that I knovv or believe to be true, seeing I

am ſo ſhortly in all probability to render an account to the ſearcher of hearts of all my words and actions, being now (at the leaſt) upon the ninetyfifth yeare of my age. And I acknowledge it a great mercy and favour of God, that he hath reſerved me thus long, to cleare the Church of England and my ſelf of this moſt notorious Slander, before he takes me to himſelf. For I can not imagine any reaſon, why this ſhameleſſe writer might not have caſt the ſame upon any of my Reverend Brethren as well as me, but onely that I being the eldeſt, it was probable I might be in my graue, before this untruth could be taken notice of in the world. And now I thanke god I can cherefully ſing my nunc dimittis, unleſſe it pleaſe him to reſerve me for the like ſervice hereafter: for I deſire not to live any longer upon earth, then he ſhall be pleaſed to make me his inſtrument to defend the truth, and promote his glory. And for the more ſolemne and full Confirmation of this my free and voluntary proteſtation and

declaration I have hereunto ſet my hand and ſeale, this ſeventeenth day of July Anno Domini 1658.

THOMAS DVRESME.

Signed ſealed published and declared, in the preſence of Tho: Sanders Sen: Tho: Sanders Iun:, Iohn Barwick Clerke, R: Gray, Evan Davies.

I Tobias Holder publick Notary, being requeſted by the Right Reverend Father in God Thomas Lo. Bishop of Dureſme, at the houſe of Thomas Sanders Eſquire, in the Parish of Flamſtead, in the County of Hartford, in the yeare of our Lord moneth and day above ſpecified, was then and there perſonally preſent, where and vvhen the ſaid Reverend Bishop did Signe publish and declare this his Proteſtation and declaration above vvriten, to be his Act and deed, and did cauſe his Authentick Epiſcopall Seale, to be there to affixed, in the preſence of the vvitneſſes vvhoſe names are there to ſubſcribed. And did then and

nd then likevviſe ſigne publish and declare as his Act and deed, another of the ſame Tenor vvritten in paper, vvhich he Signed vvith his Manuall Seale, in the preſence of the ſame vvitneſſes. All this I heard, ſaw, and therefore knovv to be done. In Teſtimony vvhereof I have ſubſcribed and thereto ut my uſuall and accuſtomed Notaries Signe. TOBIAS HOLDER.

Publick Notary.

How doth this ſo ſolemne Proteſtation gree with the former Relation of the Fahers, that the Biſhop of *Durham* affirmed ublickly in the upper houſe that *the firſt roteſtant Biſhops were Conſecrated in the Nages head*, that *they were not Conſecrated at Lambeth*, that *this was notorious to all the world*, hat *it is not Credible that any will be ſo impudent as to denie it*, that *all the reſt of the Biſhops pproved his aſſertion by their ſilence, and were lad to have ſuch a retiring place againſt the reſbyterians*, that *none of the Biſhops did give redit to Mr. Maſons new found Regiſters?* Even s light and Darkneſſe, or truth and falhood, or two Contradictory Propoſitions o agree together. This is the firſt witneſſe whom any of that party hath adven-

tured to cite publickly and directly fo
that infamous ſtory whi leſt he was livin
And they ſee the ſucceſſe of it. I hope th
will be wiſer hereafter, then to cite any mo
re living witneſſes.

But it may be that they who do not ſtic
to ſuppoſe that our Arch-Bishops *make fa*
certificates, may object this is but t
Teſtimony of the Bishop of *Durham* in h
owne cauſe. Let us ſee whether the oth
Bishops diſſent from the Bishop of *D*
reſme. Take the Teſtimony of them all, wh
ſate in that Parliament, which are now l
ning except the Biſhop of *Bangor*, who
abſence in *Wales* is the onely reaſon why h
is not a ſubſcriber with the reſt.

Whereas we the ſurviving Bishops of t
Church of England, who ſate in the Parliam
begun at Weſtminſter the third day of Nove
ber 1640, *are required by our Reverend Br*
ther the Lord Biſhop of Dureſme, to decl
and atteſt the truth, concerning an imputati
caſt upon him in the Pamphlet of that namele
Author, mentioned in his Proteſtation and D
claration here prefixed. And whereas we a
obliged to performe what he requeſteth, b
for the juſtification of the truth, and for t
clearing of our ſelves of another ſlanderous a
perſion, which the ſame Authour caſteth up

s, as if we had heard our ſaid Reverend
rother make ſuch a ſpeech as is there
retended, and by our ſilence had ap-
roved, what that Libeller falſely affir-
eth was delivered in it. We do hereby
lemnely proteſt and declare before God
nd all the world, that we never knew
f any ſuch booke preſented to the houſe
f Peeres, as he there pretendeth, nor
elieve any ſuch was ever preſented:
nd therefore could never heare any
uch ſpeech made againſt it, as he men-
oneth, by our ſaid Reverend brother or
ny other, much leſſe approve of it by our
lence. And if any ſuch booke had
ene preſented, or any ſuch ſpeech had
ene made, there is none among us ſo
norant or negligent of his duty in de-
nding the truth, but would have
ene both able and ready to have confu-
d ſo groundleſſe a fable, as the pretẽded
nſecration of Bishops at the Nagges
ead, out of the Authentick and knowne
giſters of the Church ſtill extant, menti-
ed and faithfully trãſcribed and publi-
ed by Mr. Maſon ſo long before. For the

confirmation of which truth, and att
ſtation of what our ſaid Reverend Br
ther hath herewith Proteſted and decl
red, we have hereunto ſet our hand
Dated the 19th. day of Iuly Anno D
mini 1658.

LONDON.	BATH. & WELL
M. ELI.	JO. ROFFENS.
BR. SARUM.	OXFORD.

If all theſe prooſes ſeeme not ſatisfac
ry to the Fathers, they ſhall have mo
Let them take the Teſtimony of t
Principall Peeres now living, who ſa
then in Parliament.

VVe of the Lords temporall whoſe nam
are here under written, who ſate in t
Parliament begun at Weſtminſter t
third day of November 1640, *being d*
ſired by the Biſhop of Dureſme to teſti
our knowledge concerning an imput
tion caſt upon him, about a ſpeech pr
tended to be made by him in that Pa
liament, more particularly mention
and diſavowed in his prefixed Proteſt
tio

on, Doe hereby testify and Declare, that to the best of our present knowledge and remembrance, no such booke against Bishops as is there mentioned, was presented to the house of Peeres in that Parliament. And consequently, that no such speech as is there pretended, was or could be made by him or ony other against it. In testimony whereof we have signed this our attestation with our owne hands. Dated the nineteenth day of July Anno Domini 1658.

DORCHESTER. LINDSEY.
RVTLAND. SOVTHAMTON.
LINCOLNE. DEVONSHIRE.
CLEVELAND. MONMOVTH.
DOVER.

To this proofe nothing remaineth that can be added, but onely the testimony of the Clerke of the Parliament, who after a diligent search made in the booke of the Lords house, hath with his owne hand written this short Certificate, in the margent of one of your bookes pag. 9. over against your relation, *Upon search made in the booke of the Lords house, I do not find any such booke presented, nor any entery of any such speech made by Bishop Morton.*

HENRY SCOBEL CLERK.
Of the Parliament.

And now methinkes I heare the Fathers blaming of their owne credulity, and rashneſſe, and over much confidence. They had forgotten *Epictetus* his rule, *Remember to diſtruſt.* I judge them by my ſelf, *Homo ſum, humani a me nihil alienum puto.* One circumſtance being either latent or miſtaken, may change the whole drift and ſcope of a relation. But though we would be contented to lend a skirt of our coate, to cover the fault of them who calumniate our Church: yet this relation can never be excuſed in any man from a moſt grievous miſtake, where both the perſon, and the whole ſcope of his diſcourſe is altogether miſtaken. This is almoſt as great a miſtake as the Nagges head Ordination it ſelf, where a confirmation dinner was miſtaken for a ſolemne conſecration. But thoſe who cherish ſuch miſtakes for advantage, and deck them up with new matter, and publish them to the world for undoubted truths, can not be excuſed from formall calumnie.

The laſt thing to be conſidered in this firſt part of this diſcourſe, being the vindication of the Reverend Bishop of *Dureſme*, is concerning the witneſſe, whom as the Fathers do forbeare to name, ſo shall I. Of whom they ſay foure things, that *he is one of the Ancienteſt Peeres of England*, that

he

e was preſent in Parliament when Morton *ade this ſpeech*, that *he will take his Oath of the truth of it*, and that *he can not elieve that any will be ſo impudent to denie it*. Ve have no diſpute concerning the anti-uity of Peerage, Let that paſſe: but I am onfidēt whatſoever his preſent judgement ad been either of the ſpeaker or of the peech, your witneſs would have abſtained rom uncivill language, as to ſtile the Re-erend Bishop of Dureſme a *pretended Bishop*, and plaine *Morton*, without either velt or garde. He would not have forgotten ll his degrees both in the Church and in he Scholes. He will not charge all them vith downe right *Impudence*, who tell him hat he was doubly miſtaken: Nor call that *otorious to all the world*, which he himſelf cknowledgeth that he never heard of be-ore in his life. He is not guilty of thoſe in-erences, and *eo nomines* which yon have dded. I do not beleeve that he doth, or ever id know the Bishop of *Dureſme*. ſo well as o ſweare this is the man: Nor doth take imſelf to be ſo exact an Analyſer of a diſ-ourſe, as to be able to take his Oath what vas the true ſcope of it, *pro* or *contra*; eſ-ecially whē ſome thing is ſtarted that doth uite divert his attention, as the ſound f the market bell did the Philoſophers Au-itours.

This

This is my Charity. And my ground for it is this. When I had once conference with him about this relation, he told me the name of the Naggeshead did surprise him, and he betooke himself to inquire of another what it meant. And when I urged to him, that it was incredible that any Protestant Bishop should make such a speech, unlesse he used it onely by way of Supposition, as *argumentum ad hominem*, a reason fitte for my Lord *Brookes*, that such a Consecration as that was, agreed well enough with his principles, He told me he knew not that, the Bishop might answer so for himself.

To conclude, I have heard the Bishop of *Lincolne* did once mention the Fable of the Nagges head in a speech in Parliament, but with as much Detestation of it, as our Ancestours used to name the Devill. Why might not the mistake both of the person and of the drift or scope of his speech, be the occasion of this relation? I had rather out of charity run into two such right handed errours, then condemne a Noble Gentleman of whose ingenuity I never had any reason to doubt, of a malicious lie. Take it at the very best, the mistake is great enough, to mistake both the person of the speaker, and the scope of his speech. I hope they will all do that which in Con-

science

ſcience they are obliged to do, that is acquitte the Bishop of *Dureſme*, and crave his pardon for their miſtake. If they do not, the world will acquitte him, and condemne them. But the greateſt miſtake of all others was, to publish ſuch a notorious untruth to the world, ſo temeariouſly without better adviſe.

CHAP. III.

Three reaſons againſt the Nagges head Conſecration, 1. from the Contradictions of the Relaters, 2. from the lateneſſe of the Diſcovery, 3. from the Strictneſſe of our lavves.

NOw having beaten Downe the Pillar about their eares, which they had ſet up to underproppe their Nagges head Ordination, it remaineth next to aſſault the maine fable it ſelf, as it is related by theſe Fathers. Having told, how the Proteſtant Doctors who were deſigned for Bishopricks in the beginning of Queene Eliſabeths Reigne, *had prevailed with Anthony Kitchin Bishop of Landaffe, to give them a meeting*

at the Nagged head in Cheapeſyde, in hope he would Ordeine them Bishops there. And how the Bishop of Landaffe *through Bishop Bonners threatenings refuſed*, (all which shall be examined and laid open to the view of the world in due order, how it is ſtuffed with untruth and abſurdities.) They adde, that *being thus deceived of their expectation, and having no other meanes to come to their deſires* (that is, to obteine conſecration), *they reſolved to uſe Mr. Scories helpe, an Apoſtate religious Prieſt, who having borne the name of Bishop in King Edward the ſixths time, vvas thought to have ſufficient povver to performe that Office, eſpecially in ſuch a ſtrait neceſſity as they pretended. He, having caſt of together vvith his Religious habite all ſcruple of conſcience, vvillingly vvent about the matter, vvhich he performed in this ſort. Having the bible in hand, and they all kneeling before him, he laid it upon every one of their heads or shoulders, ſaying, take thou Authority to preach the Word of God ſincerely. And ſo they roſe up*

Bishops of the newv Chureh of England. This narration of the conſecration at the Nagges head (they ſay) they *have taken out of Holywood, Conſtable, and Dr. Champneys workes.* They might as well have taken it out of Æſops fables, and with as much credit or expectation of truth on our partes.

So the controverſy betweene them and us is this. They ſay that Arch Bishop *Parker* and the reſt of the Proteſtant Bishops, in the beginning of Queene *Eliſabeths* reigne, or at the leaſt ſundry of them were conſecrated at the *Nagges head* in *Cheapeſyde* together, by Bishop *Scory* alone, or by him and Bishop *Barlow* jointly, without Sermon, without Sacrament, without any ſolemnity, in the yeare 1559. (but they know not what day, nor before what publick Notaries,) by a new phantaſtick forme. And all this they ſay upon the ſuppoſed voluntary report of Mr. *Neale* (a ſingle malicious ſpie,) in private to his owne party, long after the buſineſſe pretended to be done.

We

We ſay Arch Bishop *Parker* was conſecrated alone, at Lambeth, in the Church, by foure Bishops, authoriſed thereunto by Commiſſion under the great Seale of England, with Sermon, with Sacrament, with all due ſolemnities, upon the 17 day of December Anno 1559. before foure of the moſt eniment publick Notaries in England; and particularly by the ſame publick Notary who was Principall Actuary both at Cardinall *Pokes* Conſecration and Arch Bishop *Parkers*. And that all the reſt of the Bishops were Conſecrated at other times, ſome in the ſame moneth but not upon the ſame day, ſome in the ſame yeare but not the ſame moneth, and ſome the yeare following. And to prove the truth of our relation and falshood of theirs, we produce the Regiſtet of the See of Canterbury, as authentick as the world hath any, the Regiſters of the other fourteene Sees then vacant, all as carefully kept by ſworne Officers as the Recordes of the Vatican it ſelf. We produce all the Commiſſions under the privy ſeale and great Seale of England: We produce the rolles or Recordes of the Chancery; And if the Recordes of the Signet office had not been unfortunately burned in King *Iames* his time, it might have been verified

fied by thoſe alſo: We produce an Act of Parliament expreſs in the pointe, within ſeven yeares after the Conſecration: We produce all the controverted Conſecrations published to the world in printe *Anno* 1572. three yeares before Arch Bishop *Parkers* death, whileſt all things were fresh in mens memories. Theſe bright beames had bene able to daſell the eies of *Mr. Neale* himſelf, whileſt he was living, and have made him recant his lewd lie, or confeſs himſelf ſtarke blinde.

The firſt reaſon which I bring againſt this ridiculous fable, it taken from the palpable Contradictions, and groſſe abſurdities and defects of thoſe Roman Catholick writers, who have related this filly tale of a tub, and agree in nothing but in their common malice againſt the Church of England. It is no ſtrange matter for ſuch as write upon heareſay, or relie upon the exact truth of other mens notes or memories, to miſtake in ſome inconſiderable circumſtance: as to ſet downe the name of a place amiſſe, which may be the tranſcribers faulte, or the printers, as well as the Authours: Or to ſay two Suffragans for one, when there were two named in the Commiſſion, and but one preſent at the Conſecration. Such immateriall differences which *The firſt reaſon.*

which are ſo remote from the heart of t
Cauſe, about indifferent Circumſtanc
may bring the exactneſſe of the Relati
into queſtion, but not the ſubſtantiall tr
of it. Such petty unſignificant variatio
do rather prove that the Relations we
not made upon compact or confederac
Eſpecially where there are originall R
cordes taken upon the place by ſworne N
taries, whoſe names, and hands, and Acts a
as well known to every man verſed in t
Recordes of thoſe times, as a man knowe
his owne houſe. To which all Relate
and Relations muſt ſubmitte, and are rea
to ſubmitte as to an infallible rule.

But he who should give credit to ſu
a ſilly ſenſleſſe fable as this is, which
wholy compoſed of abſurd, improbabl
incoherent, inconſiſtent, contradicto
fictions, had need to have a very implici
faith. The greateſt ſhew of any acco
among them is about the Conſecrater, y
even in this they diſagree one from ano
ther. The common opinion is that B
shop *Scory* alone did conſecrate them. B
Mr. Conſtable one of their principall a
thours ſuppoſeth, that Bishop *Barl*
might joine with him in the Conſecratio
And *Sanders*, whoſe penne in other caſe
uſeth to runne over, one who had as muc
malic

malice as any of them, and had reason to know the passages of those times better then all of them, leaveth it doubtfull, when, or where, or by whom they were ordeined, *quomodocunque facti sunt isti Pseudo-Episcopi*; *by what meanes soever they were ordeined.*

But they disagree much more among themselves, who they should be that were ordeined. First *Mr. Waddesworth* (whose ingenuity deserveth to be commended) doth not say that any of our Bishops were actually consecrated there, but onely that *there was an attempt to consecrate the First of them*, that was Arch-Bishop *Parker*. But that which destroyeth the credit of this attempt is this, that it is evident by the Recordes, that Arch-Bishop *Parker* was not personally present at his Confirmation in *Bowes* Church, or at his Confirmation dinner at the *Nagges head*, which gave the occasion to this merry Legend: but was confirmed by his Proctor *Nicholas Bullingham* Doctor in the Lawes, upon the ninth of December Anno 1559. A man may be confirmed by Proxie, but no man can be

ordeined by proxie. It is a ruled caſe i
their owne law, *Non licet Sacramentum ali*
quod præter matrimonium abſenti adminiſtrar
So if there was an attempt to conſecra
any man at the *Nagges head*, it muſt b
Doctor *Bullingham*, it could not be Arc
Bishop *Parker*.

Others ſay there was more then an at
tempt, that one or more of them were
ctually ordeined there: but they nam
none. Others name ſome, but they ac
corde not one with another in naming
them. Some ſay, *Iewell, Sands, Horn, Grinda*
where was Arch Bishop *Parker*? Othe
ſay, *Parker, Grindall, Horne, Sands*. Laſt
others ſay, they were all ordeined ther
who were named to Bishopricks, a
number fifteen of them. Theſe fathe
ſpeake indefinitely, *Parker and his fellow*
But they ſeeme to extend this word *fellow*
as farre as Doctor *Champneys* fifteene: f
they tell us, that they *all kneeled do*
before him, and *he laid the Bible upon ev*
one of their heads or shoulders. Thus th
Cadmean brethren, like thoſe falſe wi
neſſes which teſtified againſt Chriſt, deſtr
one another with their mutuall Contr
dictions..

Third

Thirdly, the time is a principall Circumstance in all Consecrations, and is evermore most punctually recorded by the Actuaries, or publick Notaries. But in this fabulous Relation the time is concealed. It seemeth the Forger was no good Actuary, and either did not know how materiall that Circumstance was, or had forgotten it. Onely Doctor *Champney* telleth us, that it was before the ninth of September Anno 1559. But this is not precise enough for an Act: and moreover, it is most apparently false and impossible. For whereas there are two Commissions under the greate Seale of *England*, for the Confirmation and Consecration of Arch Bishop *Parker*, both recorded in the Rolles; the one which was not executed, dated the said very ninth day of September; and the other which was executed, dated the sixth day of December following: if Doctor Champney said true, Arch Bishop *Parker* was consecrated before he was confirmed, yea before there was any Commission out, either for his Consecration or Confirmation; which is one of the drowsiest dreames that could droppe from an English penne.

Laſtly, every Conſecration muſt be performed before one or more publick Notaries. (We ſhall ſhew them Notaries enough of great eminence, beyond all exception, for Arch-Bishop *Parkers* true Conſecration.) And indeed what could a Conſecration availe any man, without a publick Notary to Recorde it, to make an authentick Certificate of it under the ſeale of the principall Conſecrater? Now who recorded the *Nagges head* Conſecratiou? who drew it up into Acts? Who certified it? No body, becauſe the ſilly forger did not underſtand what things were requiſite to a Conſecration. Onely as the *Athenians* ſometimes ſaid of *Metiochus*, *Metiochus grindes the corne*, *Metiochus bakes the bread*, *Metiochus mendes the highwaies*, *Metiochus doth all, an evill yeare to Metiochus*: So we may ſay of Mr. *Neale*; Mr. *Neale* was the ſpie, Mr. *Neale* was the witneſs, Mr. *Neale* was the publick Notary, Mr. *Neale* was the chiefe Eugenier or forger, Mr. *Neale was* all, what honours are due to Mr. *Neale*?

Qui tot ſuſtinuit, qui tanta negotia ſolus.

So they feine a Conſecration without a publick Notary, or (which is all one) no man

man ever knew who that publick Notary was; At a time impoſſible, or els no man knoweth at what time; without any certeinty who conſecrated, whether *Scory* alone, or *Scory* and *Barlow* together, or God knoweth who; and yet with much leſse certeinty who were conſecrated, whether none at all, but onely an attempt was made, or one, and who that one was; or ſome indefinitely, without naming who they were, or how many they were; or foure expreſſly, but diſſenting one from another who thoſe foure were. Here is a ſtory compoſed altogether of uncerteinties and contradictions, like *A man and no man, hit a bird and no bird, on a tree and no tree, with a ſtone and no ſtone.* To make this uncerteine, groundleſs, contradictory rumour, to be the touchſtone of truth, and to overballance all the authentick Recordes of the Kingdome, in a matter of ſuch publick concernment: is juſt to make the Parish clock goe truer then the Sun, becauſe the Clerke who ſettes it is our Freind.

My ſecond reaſon againſt this ſenſeleſs fable, is the late diſcovery of it to the world, and the long concealing of it in holes and corners before they durſt adventure preſent it to the view of the world, *Seeond reaſon.*

Can any man who is in his right wittes be ſo ſtupide as to imagine, that the *Nagges head* Ordination happened in the yeare 1559, and (if theſe Fathers ſay truely) was *notoriouſly knowne to all the world*; and that it ſhould never once Peepe into the light for almoſt a whole age after it was pretended to have been done, that is till after the yeare ſixteen hundred? We uſe to ſay a monſter is but nine daies wonder: but this ugly monſter was not taken notice of in the world untill after forty yeares. The reaſon is evident; Either it was then but newly hatched, or it had bene kept all that time at dry nurſe in a cloſet. If it had bene ſo *notorious to all the world* from the yeare 1559 as the fathers feine, all the windowes in the *Nagges head* would have been full of it, and the roome would have been shewed to all their gueſts, where ſuch a prodigious pageant had bene acted.

I dare appeale to the judgments of theſe Fathers themſelves, whether it be Credible, that this ſtory should be notoriouſly knowne to the world in the beginning of Queene *Eliſabeths* reigne, and yet neither *Stapleton*, nor *Harding*, nor *Briſtow*, nor *Alan*, nor *Reynoldes*, nor *Parſons*, nor any one of all their Roman Catholick writers, should

ſo

ſo much as mention it for forty yeares enſuing; eſpecially writing ſo much as they did upon that very ſubject, the validity or invalidity of our Ordination. How could their ſilence have bene excuſed from betraying of their cauſe, to loſe ſuch an egregious advantage? Was it peradventure out of affection to us, to conceale the Defects of the Proteſtāts? No, they had will enough, but they durſt not avouch ſuch a Monſtrous untruth in earneſt, (if ever they did heare of ſuch a vain rumour, which I can not eaſily beleeve,) ſo contrary to the knowledg of tha t age.

Eſpecially let them tell me how it commeth to paſſe, that Nicolas *Sanders*, who profeſſeth to write *the Eccleſiaſticall hiſtory of England, from the one and twentieth yeare of Henry the eighth*, untill the Eight and *twentieth yeare of Queene* Eliſabeth then current, in his three bookes of the *Originall and progreſſe of the English Schiſme*, hath not one ſyllable of the *Nagges head* Ordination? He was never accuſed of partiality for the Proteſtants, (but as malicious againſt the Proteſtants as any man could wish): nor of concealing truths to their advantage, but of Deviſing fables to their prejudice.

He having related the forme of our English Conſecrations, partly true and partly falſe, proceedth to this firſt Ordination of Proteſtant Bishops, in the beginning of Queen *Eliſabeths* Reigne; alleging that *the Catholick Bishops refuſed to impoſe hands upon them*, And that *they had not of themſelves two or three Bishops, or ſo much as one Metropolitan.* What a shameleſſ untruth is this, that there were not two or three Proteſtant Bishops, when the Queenes Commiſſion under the great Seale of *England*, recorded in the Rolles, is directed to ſeven Proteſtant Bishops, expreſly by their names and titles?

De Schiſm. Angl. c. 3. p. 400. Edit Rom.

He addeth, that *they were very inſtant with an Irish Arch Bishop to have preſided at their Ordination, but he would not.* He miſtaketh the matter altogether, They might have had ſeven Irish Arch Bishops and Bishops if they had needed them; where the proceedings were not ſo rigorous, where the old Bishops complied and held their places, and joined in ſuch Eccleſiaſticall Acts, untill they had made away to their kindred, all the lands belonging to their Sees. We found one Bishoprick reduced to

five

ve markes a yeare by theſe tempo-
ſers, another to forty shillings a yeare,
nd all of them to very poore pittances
t Prelates. But by this meanes there
anted no Ordeiners. Never did any
an queſtion the Ordination of the firſt
roteſtant Bishops in *Ireland* untill this
ay.

Then he telleth, how being thus rejected
the Catholick Bishops and the Irish
rch Bishop, they applied themſelves *to*
e lay Magiſtrate in the enſuing Parliament
r a confirmation, from whence they were called
arliamentary Bishops. By whom were
ey called ſo? By no man but himſelf
nd his fellowes. How many Ordina-
ons were paſſed over, one after another,
fore that Parliament? Was there any
ing moved in this Parliament, concer-
ng any the leaſt eſſentiall of our Epiſco-
all Ordination? Not at all, but onely
ncerning the repealing and reviving
f an English Statute. English Statutes
n not change the eſſentialls of
rdination, either to make that
onſecration valid which was invalid,
r that invalid which was valid. The
lidity or invalidity of Ordination, depen-
deth

deth not upon humane law, but upon t
inſtitution of Chriſt. Neither did we e
ſince that Parliament change one ſyllab
in our forme of Ordination. Then wh
was this Confirmation which he ſpeak
of? It was onely a Declaration of the Pa
liament, that all the Objections which the
men made againſt our Ordinations, we
ſlanders and calumnies: and that all t
Biſhops which had been ordeined in t
Queenes time, had bene rightly ordeine
according to the forme preſcribed by t
Church of England, and the Lawes of t
Land. Theſe men want no confidence
who are not aſhamed to cite this Statute
this caſe. But we ſhall meete with th
Parliament againe.

In all this impertinent Diſcourſe, whe
is the fable of the *Nagges head* Ordinatio
It had bene a thouſand times more mat
riall then all this *Iargon*. And you may
ſure it had not been miſſing, if there h
bene the leaſt graine of truth in it, or
there had but been any ſuſpicion of it wh
that was written. It was not then fu
thirty yeares after Arch-Biſhop *Park*
Conſecration, and there were ſtore of ey
witneſſes living to have hiſſed ſuch a ſenſ
leſſe fable out of the world. And therefo

, *Sand*

nders very prudently for himſelf, after ſo
any intimations, paſſeth by their Or-
nation in a deepe ſilence, which was the
ely worke he tooke in hand to shew.
Qualeſcunque fuerint aut quomodocun-
ue facti ſint iſti Pſeudo-Epiſcopi &c.
What manner of perſons ſoever theſe
alſe-Bishops were, or after what man-
er ſoever they were ordeined &c.
Bishop *Scory* had ordeined them all
the *Naggeshead*, by layng a Bible
pon their heads, and this forme of
ordes, *Take thou Authority to pre-*
ch the word of god Sincerely, M. Säders
eeded not to have left the caſe ſo
oubtfull, how they were ordeined.
nd if there had bene the leaſt ſuſpicion of
, he would have blowen it abroad upon
ſilver Trumpet: but God be thanked
here was none. The univerſall ſilence of
l the Romish writers of that age, when
he *Naggeshead* Ordination is pretended to
ave been done, in a caſe which concer-
ed them all ſo nearely, and which was the
hiefe ſubject of all their diſputes; is a
onvincing proofe to all men who are not
ltogether poſſeſſed with prejudice, that
either

either it was deviſed long after, or was ſ
lewde a lie, that no man dared to ow
it, whileſt thouſands of eyewitneſſes
Arch Bishop *Parkers* true Conſecration
Lambeth were living.

The third Reaſon.

A third reaſon, againſt this ridiculo
libell of the *Nagges head* Conſecratio
is taken from the ſtrictneſſ of our law
which allow no man to conſecrate or
conſecrated but in a ſacred place, wi
due matter and forme, and all the Ri
and Ceremonies preſcribed by the Chur
of *England*. No man muſt be Conſe
crated by fewer then foure Bishops,
three at leaſt, And that after the El
ction of the Deane and Chapiter is due
confirmed, And upon the mandate
Commiſſion of the King under the gre
ſeale of *England*; under the paine of
Premunire, that is, the forfeiture of land
and goods, and livings, and liberty, a
protection. They allow not Conſecr
tion in a Taverne, without due matt
and forme, without the Ceremonies a
ſolemnity preſcribed by the Church, wit
out Election, without Confirmatio
without letters Patents, by one ſing
Bishop, or two at the moſt; ſuch as th
fei

25. H. 8. c. 20.

ine the *Nagges head* Ordination to have
en. Who can beleeve, that two Arch-
shops and thirteen Bishoppes, ha-
g the reputatiou of learning and pru-
nce, should wilfully thrust them-
ves into an apparent Premunire, to
feite not onely their Arch Bishopricks
d Bishopricks, but all their estates and
their hopes, for a phantastick forme,
d scandalous Consecration: when the
eene and Kingdome were favorable
them, when the forme prescribed by
Church did please them well enough,
en there were protestant Bishops of
ir owne Communion enough to Con-
rate them, when all the Churches
the Kingdome were open to them;
esse it had been Midsummer moone in
cember. and they were all starke
d, and then it is no matter where they
re consecrated?

In criminall causes, where things are
tended to be done against penall lawes,
h as this is, the proofes ought to be clea-
then the noone day light. Here is no-
g proved, but one single witnesse named
he a professed enemy, who never testi-
it upon Oath, or before a Iudge, or so
much

much as a publick Notary, or to the fa
of a proteſtant, but onely whiſpered it
corners (as it is ſaid by Adverſaries) amo
ſome of his owne party. Such a teſt
mony is not worth a deafe nut, in a
cauſe betweene party and party. If he h
bene a witneſse beyond all exception, a
had beẽ duly ſworne and legally examine
yet his teſtimony in the moſt favo
rable cauſe had been but halfe
proofe, though an hundred did
ſtifie it from his mouth, it is ſtill but
ſingle teſtimony: And as it is, it
plaine prittle prattle, and ought to be
lued no more then the shadow of an a
To admit ſuch a teſtimony, or an hu
dred ſuch teſtimonies, againſt the publi
authentick Recordes of the Kingdom
were to make our ſelves guilty of mo
madneſs, then they accuſe the Bishops
If *St. Paul* forbid *Timothy* to recei
an accuſation againſt a ſingle Presbyte
under two or three witneſſes, he would
have us to condemne fifteen Bishops of ſi
a penall crime, upon a ridiculous rumo
contrary both to the lawes and Recor
of the Kingdome. The ſeverity of
lawes doth deſtroy the credit of this fable.

CHA

CHAP. III.

The fourth and fifth reaſons againſt this improbable fiction, from the no neceſſity of it, and the leſſe advantage of it.

MY fourth plea is, becauſe there was no need to play this counterfeit pageant. e uſe to ſay Neceſſity hath no law, that regardeth no law. In time of warre the ws are ſilent, but this was a time of ace. Firſt there could be no neceſſity why ey ſhould have a clandeſtine Conſecrati-, without a Regiſter or publick Notary, hen they might have had an Army of pu-ick Notaries ready upon their whiſtle, evē der their elbowes at *Bowes* Church, out the Courtes of the *Arches*, and the *Audi-ce*, and *Prerogative*. Secondly, there was neceſſity why they ſhould anticipate the ueenes *Letters patents* for their conſecra-on, by whoſe gracious favour they were ected, and of the accomplishmēt whereof due time they could not doubt; unleſſe ey would wilfully deſtroy their owne opes, by ſuch a mad pranke as this had een, that is, unleſſe they would them-

elves

ſelves hew downe the bough where up they ſtood. Thirdly, there was no ne ceſſity that they ſhould chuſe a comm Taverne for the place of their Conſecr tion, when the Keies of all the Churches the Kingdome were at their Comma Fourthly, there could be no neceſſity w they ſhould deſerte the forme of Ordi tion preſcribed by the Law, which w agreeable both to their judgements, and their deſires, and to their duties; and omitte the eſſentialls of Ordination, b matter and forme, which they knew w enough, to be conſecrated after a n brainſick manner.

Then all the neceſſity which can be p tended, is want of a competent number Ordeiners. Suppoſe there had bene ſu a neceſſity to be ordeined by two Bisho or by one Bishop, this very neceſſity h bene a ſufficient Diſpenſation with the gour of the Canons, and had inſtified t Act. as *St. Gregory* pleadeth to *Auguſti*

Reſp. Int. 8. Auguſt. *In the English Church wherein there no other Bishop but thy ſelf, thou ca not ordeine a Bishop otherwiſe then alo*

And after this manner our Firſt Engli Bishops were ordeined. And ſo mig the

hese protestant Bishops have bene validely ordeined, if they received the essentialls of Ordination. But what a remedy is this, because they could not have a competent number of Bishops, according to the canons of the Church, and the lawes of England, therefore to reject the essentialls of Ordination, for a defect which was not essentiall, and to cast of obedience to their superiours, both civill ād Ecclesiasticall? This had bene just like little children which because they cā not have some toy which they desire, cast away their garments, and whatsoever their Parēts had provided for them. Want of three Bishops might in some cases make a consecration illegall or uncanonicall, but it could not have rendered it invalide, as this silly pretēded Ordinatiō had.

But now I come up close to the ground worke of the table, and I denie positively that there was any such want of a competent number of Bishops, as they pretend. And for proofe hereof, I bring no vaine rumours or uncertein conjectures, but the evident and authentick testimony of the great seale of England, affixed to the Queenes *Letters Patents*, for authorising the Confirmation and Consecration of Arch-Bishop *Parker*, dated the sixth day of *December*, Anno 1559. directed *Rot. 14. Pars 2. Elisab.*

&ted to ſeven proteſtant Bishops, namel
Anthony Bishop of *Landaffe*, *Willia*
Barlow ſometimes Bishop of *Bath* and *We*
les, and then elect Bishop of *Chicheſte*
Iohn Scory ſometimes Bishop of *Chicheſte*
then Elect Bishop of *Hereforde*, *Mi*
Coverdale ſometimes Bishop of *Excete*
Iohn Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*, *Io*
Suffragan Bishop of *Thetford*, and *Io*
Bale Bishop of *Oſſory* in *Ireland*. Thr
are a Canonicall number, if there we
choiſe of ſeven, then there was no wan
of a competent number to ordeine can
nically. I adde, that if it had bene nee
full, they might have had ſeven more o
of *Ireland*, Arch Bishops and Bishops, f
ſuch a worke as a conſecration. *Irela*
never wanted ſtore of Ordeiners. N
ever yet did any man object, want of
Competent number of Conſecraters, to
Irish Proteſtant Bishop. They who co
curred freely in the Conſecration of Pr
teſtant Bishops at home, would not ha
denied their concurrence in England,
they had been commanded. Which m
kes me give no credit to that vaine repo
of an Irish Arch Bishop priſoner in
tower, who refuſed to complie with
deſires of the proteſtant Bishops, *for his*
berty and a large rewarde. But the Ar
Bisho

shop wanteth a name, and the Fable
nteth a ground; the witneſſes and per-
ders are all unkowne. And if there had
ne a grane of truth in this relation; yet
his caſe one man is no man, one mans
ſuſall ſignifieth nothing.

gainſt the evident truth of this aſſertion,
o things may be oppoſed out of the re-
ion of theſe Fathers. The Firſt is par-
lar, concerning the Bishop of Landaffe,
t he was no Proteſtant, but a Roman
tholick untill his death. So they ſay in-
ed, that *he was the onely man of all the Ca-
lick Bishops, that tooke the oath of Supremacy.*
ſerve how prejudice and partiality doth
dfold men of learning and partes;
ey confeſs he tooke the oath of ſupre-
cy, and yet eſteeme him a good Roman
tholick. I ſee cenſures go by favour,
one may Steale an horſe, better then
ther looke over the hedge. I am well
tented, that they reckon him for ſo
od a Catholick.

They adde, that *he knew* Parker
*the reſt which were to be ordered Bi-
ps to be hereticks, and averſe from
Doctrine of the Roman Catholick
urch, which he Conſtantly adhered
o, (the Supremacy onely excepted)*

during his life. And a little after they t
us, that *he desired to be numbred among Ca*
licks. Now what if the Bishop of Land
after all this should prove to be a protest
Then all the Fathers story is quite spoil
And so he was. If he knew *Parker* and t
rest, to be heretickes, he knew himself
be one of their brother hereticks. I
daily masse was the English Leiturgy
well as theirs, He adhered constantly t
Protestant Bishoprick during his life,
well as any of them, And if he did
hold it as long as any of them,
was deaths fault, and none of
fault.

They say *they prevailed with him to*
them a meeting at the Nagges head in Che
side, where they hoped he would ordeine
Bishops, despairing that ever he would do it
Church, because that would be too great
notorious a scandall for Catholicks. Th
were too modest. They might easily h
prevailed with him, or have had him co
manded to joine in their consecration
Church, after a legall manner. He
did not stick at renouncing the Pope,
swearing an oath of Supremacy to
Prince, would not have stucke at a le
Ordination, upon the just command

s Prince. But to desire him to do it in a verne, in a clandestine manner, without e authority of the greate seale, before eir election was confirmed, was to desire n out of Curtesy to run into a Premure, that is to forfeit his Bishoprick of andaffe, his estate, his liberty. Is it come a more notorious scandall to tholicks, to ordeine in a Church, then a taverne, in the judgment of these thers? There may be scandall taken at e former, but notorious scandall is given the later.

Here Bishop *Bonner* steppeth upon the ge, and had wellneare prevented the hole pageant, by sending his *Chaplein to Bishop of Landaffe, to forbid him under ne of excommunication to exercise any h power of giving Orders in his diocesse, where h the old man being terrified, and other e moved in conscience refused to proceed.* hop *Bonner* was allwaies very fierce ich way soever he went: If *Acworth* say e, he escaped once very narrowly in me, either burning or boiling in scalding de, for being so violent before the sembly of Cardinalls, against the Pope, the behalf of *Henry* the eight, if he had secured himself by flight. Afterwards made such bonefires of protestants,

Acworth cont. monar. Sander. l. 6. p. 195.

and rendered himſelf ſo odious, that h
priſon was his onely ſafeguard from be
torne in pieces by the People. But t
was, *dum ſtetit Ilium & ingens Gloria T*
crorum, whileſt he had his Prince to be
ſecond. Now he was deprived, and had
more to doe with the Bishoprick of Lo
don, then with the Bishoprick of C
ſtantinople, he had the habituall pow
of the Keies, but he had no flock to exe
ciſe it upon. If he had continued Bish
of *London* ſtill, what hath the Bishop
London to do with the Bishop of *Landa*
Par in parem non habet poteſtatem. Third
Bowes Church which is neare the *Nagg*
head, wherein the Eccleſiaſticall parte
this ſtory, ſo farre as it hath any truth
it, was really acted, (that is the Confirm
tion of Arch Bishop Parkers electio
though it be in the City of London,
many Churches more, is not in the Dioce
of London, but a Peculiar under the J
risdiction of the Arch-*B*ishop of *Cant*
bury.

Laſtly, the Fathers ſay that *when Par*
and the reſt ſee that he had refuſed, they
viled the poore old man, calling him dot
foole, and ſome of them ſaying, This old fo
thinketh that we can not be Bishops, unleſſe

be greaſed. The contrary is evident by the Recordes of the confirmation, that Arch Bishop *Parker* was not preſent in perſon: So this whole narration is compoſed of untruthes, and miſtakes, and incongruities, and contradictions. But that which diſcovereth the falſity of it apparently to all the world is this, that the Bishop of Landaff lived and died a proteſtant Bishop, in the reigne of Queene Eliſabeth, as he had bene formerly in the reigne of King Edward, for proofe whereof I produce two of their owne Authours. The one is Sanders, *But the Bishops, who had bene created out of the Church in thoſe moſt wicked times, who had now repented from their hearts of their Schiſme, being not contented with this common diſpenſation and confirmation, did each of them particularly crave pardon of their former grievous fault from the See Apoſtolick, and Confirmation in their Bishopricks, excepting the Bishop of Landaffe, who omitting it rather out of negligence then malice, did onely relapſe into Schiſme in the reigne of Queene Eliſabeth, as we interprete it by the juſt judgement of god.* He acknowledgeth, that he became a Proteſtant againe, that is in their language, *relapſed into Schiſme.* The other is cited by Doctor Harding, *We had onely one foole*

Sand. de Schiſm. l. 2. p. 350

Confut. Apol. parte 6. c. 2.

among us, (we see whose livery the foole was,) *who now I know not by what entisements is become yours, being unworthy the name of a Lord and a Bishop, whose learning is very little, and his credit by this action much lost.* Thus writeth Doctor *Harding* of the Bishop of *Landaffe*, about the fifth yeare of Queene *Elisabeth*, at which time he was living, and continued protestant Bishop of *Landaff*.

A second objection against the truth of that which hath bene said of the competent Number of our Protestant Bishops to make a canonicall Ordination, is an exception against all the seven Bishops named in the letters Patents, that they were no true Bishops, because all of them were ordeined in a time of Schisme, and two of them in King *Edwards* time, according to a new forme of Ordination, and consequently they could not ordeine. *That Ordination which was instituted by Edward the sixth was judged invalide by the Catholicks, and so declared by publick judgment in Queene Maries reigne, in so much as leases made by King Edward*

Brookes Novel, Cases placit. 493.

ards Bishops , though confir-ed by Deane and Chapiter were ot esteemed available , becauſe they ere not (ſaith the ſentence) conſecra-d, nor Bishops.

To the Firſt part of this objection, that ur conſecraters were ordeined themſelves Schiſmaticks or in a time of Schiſme , anſwer three waies. Firſt this argument a meere begging of the quæſtion. The aſe in briefe is this. If thoſe branches of apall power which we caſt out of *England* our Lawes at the Reformation , were laine uſurpations , then our Reformation but a reinfanchiſement of our ſelves,and e Schiſme lieth at their dore , then they ay queſtion the validity of their owne Ordination upon this ground,not ours:But e are ready to mainteine to all the world at all thoſe branches of Papall power , hich we caſt out by our lawes at the Re-ormation , were groſſe uſurpations , irſt introduced into England above ele-en hundred yeares after Chriſt. So this art of the Objection concerneth them ot us.

Secondly theſe Fathers know wel enough, nd can not but acknowledg, that accor-

ding to the principles of the Catholi
Church and their owne practiſe, the Or
nation not onely of Schiſmaticks, bu
hereticks, if it have no eſſentiall defec
valide, and the perſons ſo Ordeined ou
not to be reordeined, but onely reconcil
Many Orthodox Chriſtians had their h
orders from hereticall Arrians. If *Cr*
mer, and Latimer, and Barlow, and *Ho*
kins, were no true Bishops, becauſe th
were ordeined in a time of Schiſm
then *Gardinar*, and *Bonner*, and *T*
ſtall, and *Thurleby*, &c. were no true *B*
shops, for they were ordeined in a ti
of Schiſme likewiſe; then Cardinall *Po*
and Bishop *Watſon*, and *Chriſtopher*
and all reſt of their Bishops were no tr
Bishops who were ordeined by theſe. S
to put out one of our eies (like the envio
man in the fable) they would put out both
their owne.

Thirdly I anſwer, that it was not we wh
made a Diſcrimination betweene our *Bi*
shops and their Bishops, as to the poi
of Ordination, but the Marian *Bisho*
themſelves, who made a mutuall com
pact, *one and all*, that none of them should
impoſe hands upon any new electe
Bishops; thinking vainely, there could n
othe

other Conſecraters have bene found out, and that by this meanes they ſhould both preſerve their Biſhopricks, and bring the Queene to their bent: but they found themſelves miſerably deceived. Many Biſhops who had bene chaſed out of their Biſhopricks in Queene Maries daies, did now returne from exile, and ſupplie the place of Conſecraters. Then *conjurationis eos penituit*, *The Biſhops repented of their Conſpiracy.* Multi ad judices recurrunt, &c. *many of them ran to the Iudges, confeſſed their obſtinacy, and deſired leave to take the oath of Supremacy.* Thus writeth *Acworth* an Author of good account in, thoſe daies. If this foolish conſpiracy had not bene. we had had no Difference about our Conſecrations.

Acworth. cont. Sander. l.2.pag. 197.

To the ſecond part of this objection, that the forme of Ordeining uſed in King Edwards daies, was declared invalide in Queene Maries Daies, I anſwer, Firſt, that we have no reaſon to regarde the Iudgment of their Iudges in Queene Maries Dayes, more then they regard the judgment of our Iudges in Queene Eliſabeths daies. They who made no ſcruple to take away their lifes, would make no ſcruple to take away their holy Orders.

Se

Secondly I anſwer that which *the Fathers* call a *ſentence*, was no ſentence. The word is *Dicitur*, *it is ſaid* or *it is reported*, not *decretum eſt*, *it is decreed*. Neither were Queene Maries lawes proper rules, nor Queene Maryes Iudges at common law the proper Iudges, of the validity of an Epiſcopall conſecration, or what are the eſſentialls of ordination, according to the inſtitution of Chriſt. They have neither rules, nor grounds for this in the common law.

Thirdly I anſwer that the queſtion in Queene Maries daies was not about the validity or invalidity of our Orders, but about the legality or illegality of them, not whether they were conformable to the inſtitution of Chriſt, but whether they were conformable to the Lawes of England.

The Lawes of England can neither make a valide ordination to be invalide, nor an invalide ordination to be valide, becauſe they can not change the inſtitution of Chriſt. In ſumme King Edwards Bishops were both validely ordeined according to the inſtitution of Chriſt, and legally ordeined according to the lawes of Englād. But Queene Mary changed the Law, that that

forme

forme of ordeining which had bee allowed in King Edwards daies should not be allowed in her daies. Notwithstanding Queene *Maries* law, they continued still true Bishops, by the institution of Christ, But they were not for that time legall Bishops in the eie of the Law of *England*, which is the Iudges rule. But when Queene *Elisabeth* restored King *Edwards* law, then they were not onely true valide Bishops, but legall Bishops againe.

That corollary which the fathers adde, *in so much as leases made by King* Edwards *Bishops though confirmed by the Deane and Chapiter were not esteemed available, because they were not consecrated or Bishops*, that is in the eie of the English law at that time, signifieth nothing at all. Leases concerne the *benefice* of a Bishop, not the *Office* of a Bishop. A Bishop who is legally ordeined, though he be invalidely ordeined, may make a lease which is good in law. And a Bishop which is validely ordeined, if he be illegally ordeined, may make a lease which is voide in law.

Concerning Bishop *Bonners Conscience*, that he lost his Bishoprick for his conscience, and therefore it is not probable that *he would make himself guilty of so much*

much ſacrilege, as to declare King Edwards forme of ordination to be invalide for the profit of new Leaſes, it belongeth not to me to judge of other mens Conſciences. But for Bishop *Bonners* Conſcience I referre him to the Teſtimony of one of his Freinds, *Nicolas Sanders*, who ſpeaking of Bishop Gardiner, Bishop Bonner, Bishop Tunſtall and the Bishops of Worceſter and Chicheſter, concludeth with theſe words. *Timide ergo reſtiterunt pueri Regis primatui ſpirituali, imo ſimpliciter ſubſcripſerunt, & in omnes cæteras innovationes, quæ non videbantur ipſis continere apertam hæreſim, ne Epiſcopatus & honores perderent, vel ultro, vel contra conſcientiam coacti conſenſerunt.* Therefore they reſiſted the ſpirituall primacy of the King being but a boy faintly, yea they ſubſcribed to it ſimply, and they conſented to all the reſt of the innovations, which did not ſeeme to them to conteine manifeſt hereſy, either of their owne accord, or compelled againſt Conſcience, leaſt they ſhould loſe their Bishopricks and honours. We ſee they had no great reaſon to bragge of Bishop Bonners Conſcience, who ſometimes had bene a great favorite of Cranmer and Crumwell. He got his Bishoprick by oppoſing the Pope, and loſt his Bishoprick by oppoſing his Prince.

De Schiſmate l. 2. p. 282 Edit. Rom.

But

nt if reordination be ſuch a ſacrilege;
any Romaniſts are guilty of groſſe ſacri-
ge, who reordeine thoſe Proſelites whom
ey ſeduce from us, with the ſame eſſen-
lls, matter and forme, impoſition of
nds, and theſe words *Receive the holy Ghoſt*;
herewith they had been formerly ordei-
d by us.

Laſtly I anſwer, (and this anſwer alone
ſufficient to determine this controverſy,)
at King Edwards forme of ordination
as judged valide in Queene Maries daies
all Catholicks, and particularly by
ardinall *Pole* then Apoſtolicall Legate in
ngland, and by the then Pope *Paul* the
urth, and by all the clergy and Parlia-
ent of England. The caſe was this.
the Act for repealing all ſtatutes made
gainſt the ſee of Rome, in the firſt and
cond yeares of Philip and Mary, the
ords Spirituall and Temporall in Parlia-
ent aſſembled, repreſenting the whole
ody of the Realme of England, preſented
eir common requeſt to the King and
ueene, that they would be a meanes to
e Legate to obteine ſome ſettlements by
uthority of the Popes Holineſs, for peace
ke, in ſome Articles where of this is one.
That inſtitutiõs of Beneſices and other Promotions

Eccle-

Ecclesiasticall, and Dispensations made acc
ding to the forme of the Act of Parliament mi
be confirmed. Institutions could not be co
firmed, except Ordinations were confirme
For the greatest part of the English Cler
had received both their benefices and the
holy orders, after the casting out of t
Popes usurped authority out of *Engla*
And both benefices and holy orders a
comprehended under the name of Eccles
sticall Promotions. This will appe
much more clearely by the very words
the Cardinalls Dispensation, *Ac omn*
ecclesiasticas seculares seu quorumvis o
dinum regulares personas, quæ aliqu
impetrationes, dispensationes, conce
siones, gratias & indulta, tam ordin
quam beneficia Ecclesiastica, seu ali
spirituales materias, pretensa author
tate supremitatis Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ
licet nulliter & de facto obtenuerint, &
ad cor reversæ Ecclesiæ unitati restitut
fuerint, in suis Ordinibus & beneficiis
per nosipsos seu a nobis ad id deputat
misericorditer recipiemus, prout ja
multæ receptæ fuerunt, secumque super
his opportune in domino dispensabimus;

And

d we vvill graciouſly receive (or in-
eine) *by our ſelves or by others depu-*
byus to that purpoſe, (as many have
eady been received) in their Orders
in their Benifices, all Eccleſiaſticall
ſos as well Secular as Regular of vvhat-
wer Orders, vvhich have obteined
ſuites, diſpenſations, grants, graces,
indulgences, as vvell in their
cleſiaſticall Orders, as Benefices and
er ſpirituall matters, by the preten-
authority of the Supremacy of the
urch of England, though ineffectually
onely de facto, *ſo they be penitent,*
be returned to the unity of the
urch. And vve vvill in due ſeaſon
penſe vvith them in the Lord for
eſe things.

Cardinall Poles Diſpenſation.

Here we ſee evidently, that upon the re-
eſt of the Lords Spirituall and Temporall
d Commons, being the repreſentative
dy of the Church and Kingdome of
gland, by the interceſſion of the King
d Queene, the Popes Legate did receive
perſons, which had been Ordeined or
neficed, either in the time of King *Henry*
King *Edward*, in their reſpective Orders

and Benefices, which they were actual
poſſeſſed of, at the time of the making
this diſpenſation or Confirmation, with
any exception or Condition, but onely th
that they were returned to the unity of t
Catholick Church. Neither was the
ever any one of them who were then ret
ned, either deprived of their Benefices,
compelled to be reordeined. From whe
I argue thus, Either King *Henry* the eigh
Bishops and Prieſts, and likewiſe the
shops and Prieſts Ordeined in *King*
ward the ſixths time, had all the Eſſenti
of Epiſcopall and Prieſtly Ordinatio
which were required by the inſtitution
Chriſt; and then they ought not to be re
deined, Then (in the judgement of th
Fathers themſelves) it is grievous ſacrile
to reordeine them: Or they wanted ſo
eſſentiall of their reſpective Ordinatio
which was required by the inſtitution
Chriſt; and then it was not in the po
of all the Popes and Legates that ever w
in the world, to confirme their reſpe
Orders, or diſpenſe with them to e
cute their functions in the Church.
the Legate did Diſpenſe with them to h
their Orders, and exerciſe their ſeve
functions in the Church, and the P

d confirme that diſpenſation. This th clearely deſtroy all the pretenſions the Romaniſts againſt the validity of r *Orders*.

It may perhaps be objected, that the diſ- enſative word is *recipiemus*, *we will re- ive*, not we do receive. I anſwer, the ſe is all one; If it were unlawfull to re- ive them in the preſent, it was as unlaw- ll to receive thē in the future. All that was ne after, was to take a particular abſoluti- n or confirmation from the Pope or his Le- te, which many of the Principall Clergy d, but not all; No not all the Bishops, ot the Bishop of *Landaff*, as *Sanders* wit- eſſeth, Yet he injoied his Bishoprick, So id all the reſt if the Clergy, who never ad any particular confirmation. It is not aterial at all, whether they were confir- ed by a generall or by a ſpeciall diſpenſa- on, ſo they were confirmed or diſpenſed ith at all, to hold all their *B*enefices, and exerciſe their reſpective Functions in e Church, which no man can denie. *De Schiſm. l. 2. p. 305.*

Secondly it may be objected, that it is aid in the Diſpenſation, *licet nulliter & de facto obtenuerint*, *Although they had obteined* heir Benefices and Promotions *ineffectu- lly and onely in fact* without right: which

doth intimate that their Orders were voi
and null, before they had obteined th
dispensation. I answer, that he stile
them voide and null, not absolutely but r
spectively, *quoad exercitium*, becaus
the Roman law they might not be lawfull
exercised without a Dispensation: but n
quoad Characterem, as to the Charact
If they had wanted any thing necessary
the imprinting of the Character, or a
thing essentiall by the institution of Chri
the Popes Dispensation and Confirmati
had been but like a seale put to a blan
piece of paper. And so the Cardinalls di
pensation in generall, and particularly fo
Benefices and Ecclesiasticall Promotion
Dispensations, and Graces given by suc
Order as the lawes of the Realme allowe
and prescribed, in King *Henries* time an
King *Edwards* time, was then and ther
ratified by act of Parliament.

Lastly, that this Dispensation was af
terwards confirmed by the Pope, I pro
ve by the confession of *Sanders* himself
though a malicious enemy. *He* (that i
Cardinall *Pole*, in a publick Instrumen
set forth in the name and by the autho
rity of the Pope) *Confirmed all Bishop*
whic

bich had bene made in the former chiſme; ſo they were Catholick in heir judgment of Religion, and the ix new Bishopricks which King Henry ad erected in the time of the Schiſme. And this writing being affixed to the ſtatute, was published with the reſt of he Decrees of that Parliament, and heir minds were pacified. All which hings were eſtabliſhed and confirmed fterwards, by the Letters of Pope Paul *the fourth.*

De Schiſm. l. 2. p. 350.

We have ſeene, that there were a competent number of Proteſtant Bishops beyond Exception to make a Conſecration: And ſo the neceſſity, which is their onely *Baſis* or Foundation of the *Nagges head* Conſecration, being quite taken away, his prodigious fable having nothing els to ſupport the incredibilities and inconſiſtencies of it, doth melt away of it ſelf like winter ice.

A fifth reaſon

The fifth reaſon is drawen from that well known principle in Rethorick, *Cui bono?* or what advantage could ſuch a conſecration, as the *Nagges head* Conſecration is pretended to have been, bring to the

Conſecraters or the perſons conſecrat
God and Nature never made any thing
vaine. The haire of the head, the na
upon the fingers ends, do ſerve both
ornament and muniment. The leafes
fend the bloſſomes, the bloſſomes prod
the fruite, which is Natures end. In ſ
ſitives, the Spider doth not weave
webbes, nor the ſilly Bee make her ce
in vaine. But eſpecially intellectuall cre
tures have alwaies ſome end of their A
ons. Now conſider, what good ſuch
mock Conſecratiõ could doe the perſon
conſecrated? Could it helpe them to
poſſeſſion of their Bishopricks by the l
of England? Nothing leſſe. There is ſ
a concatenation of our English Cuſtom
and Recordes, that the counterfeiting
of any one can do no good, except th
could counterfeite them all, which is i
poſſible.

When any Bishops See becomm
voide, there iſſueth a Writ out of the E
chequer to ſeiſe the Temporalties into
Kings hand, as being the ancient and w
knowne Patron of the English Churc
leaving the Spiritualties to the Arch Bish
or to the Deane and Chapiter, according
the cuſtome of the place. Next the Ki
gra

granteth his *Conge d'Eſlire* or his Licenſe to chuſe a Bishop, to the Deane and Chapiter; upon the receite of this Licenſe, the Deane and Chapiter, within a certein number of daies, chuſe a Bishop, and certifie their election to the King, under the common ſeale of the Chapiter.

Upon the returne of this Certificate, the King granteth out a Commiſſion under the great ſeale of England to the Areh Bishop, or in the vacancy of the Arch Bishoprick to ſo many Bishops, to examine the Election: and if they find it fairely made to confirme it, and after Confirmation to proceed to the Conſecration of the perſon elected, according to the forme preſcribed by the Church of England. This Commiſſion or Mandate muſt paſſe both through the Signet office and Chancery, and be atteſted by the Clerkes of both thoſe offices, and ſigned by the Lord Chanceller and Lord privy ſeale, and be inrolled. So as it is morally impoſſible there ſhould be any forgery in it.

Vpon the receite of this Mandate, the Bishops who are authoriſed by the King, do meete firſt at *Bowes* Church in *London*, where with the aſſiſtence of the Chiefe Eccleſiaſticall Judges of the Realme, the

Deane of the Arches, the Iudges of t
Prerogative and Audience, with their Re
gisters to Actuate what is done, they
solemnely in forme of law confirme t
election. Which being done, and it bei
late before it be done, the Commissione
and Iudges were and are sometimes invit
to the *Nagges head* to a dinner, as bei
very neare *Bowes* Church, and in tho
daies the onely place of note. This mee
ting led Mr. *Neale* (a man altogether un
acquainted with such formes,) into th
fooles Paradise; first to suspect, and upo
suspicion to conclude, that they were
bout an Ordination there, and lastly
broach his brainsick conceites in corner
and finding them to be greedily swallowe
by such as wished them true, to assert h
owne drowsy suspicion for a reall truth
But the mischief is, that Doctor *Parker* wh
was to be consecrated, was not present i
person, but by his Proxie.

After the Confirmation is done, com
monly about three or foure daies, (but as
happened in Arch Bishop *Parkers* case nin
daies,) the Commissioners proceed to th
Consecration; for the most part out of thei
respect to the Archbishop in the Chappell a
Lambeth, with Sermon, Sacrament, and al
solemnity requisite, according to the forme

pre-

eſcribed by the Church of *England*; in e preſence of publick Notaries or ſworne fficers, who reduce every thing that is one with all the circumſtances into Acts, d enter them into the Regiſter of the See *Canterbury*. Where they are carefully ept by the principall Officer in a publicke ffice, as Recordes, where every one who eſireth may view them from time to time, nd have a copy of them if he pleaſe. And is to be noted, that at any Conſecration, ſpecially of an Arch-Bishop, great num- ers of principall Courtiers and Citiſens are reſent: ſo as it is no more poſſible to coun- rfeite ſuch a Conſecration, then to walke viſible upon the Exchange at noone day.

After the Conſecration is doue, the per- on Conſecrated is not preſently admitted o his Bishoprick, Firſt the Arch Bishop aketh his certificate of the Conſecration ith all the circumſtances of it, under his rch-Epiſcopall ſeale: Thereupon the ing taketh the new Bishops oath of fealty nd commands that he be put into the A- tuall poſſeſſiō of his Bishoprick: Then he is nthroned, and at his Inthroniſation his Or- ination is publickly read: Then he injoieth is Spiritualties: Then iſſueth a Writ out f the Exchequer to the Sherif, to reſtore im to the Temporalties of his Bishoprick.

This

This cuſtome is ſo ancient, ſo certein, generall, that no Englishman can ſpe against it.

Here we ſee evidently how al things purſue one another, and what a neceſſ and eſſentiall connexion there is betwe them. So as the ſtealing of an Elect or the ſtealing of a Conſecration, can no man a Bishoprick, as Mr. *Neale* dre med. He that would advantage him that way, muſt falſifie all the Recor both Eccleſiaſticall and Civill. He falſifie the Recordes of the Chancery, the Signet office, of the Exchequer, the Regiſtries, of the Bishop, of the D ne and Chapiter. He muſt counterfeit hands and ſeales of the King, of the Ar Bishop, of the Lord Chanceller, the L Privy ſeale, of the Clerkes and publi Notaries, which is not imaginable. Mr. *Neale*, who firſt deviſed this dro dreame (or ſomebody for him) had more experience of our English lawes Cuſtomes, he would have feined a m probable tale, or have held his peace ever.

Anſwer me, They who are calumnia to have had their Conſecration at the *N ges head*, did they meane to conceale it

ave it kept ſecret? Then what good could do them? *De non exiſtentibus & non appa-entibus eadem eſt ratio*: If it were conceal-ed, it was all one as if it had never bene. Or did they meane to have it published? uch an Ordination had bene ſo farre from elping them to obteine a Bishoprick, hat it had rendred them uncapable of a ishoprick for ever: And moreover ſub-ected both the Conſecraters and the Con-ecrated to deprivation, and degradation, nd a Premunire or forfeiture of their ands goods and liberties, and all that were reſent at it to excommunication. *Rome* s a fitte place wherein to publish ſuch Lu-ibrious fables as this; where they can per-wade the people, that the Proteſtants are tupid creatures, who have loſt their Re-igion, their reaſon, and ſcarcely reteine heir humaine shapes. It is too bold an ttempt, to obtrude ſuch counterfeit wares n *England*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IIII.

The sixth and seventh reasons, th all the Records of England a diametrally oppoſite to their Rel tion, and do eſtablish our Relatio

HItherto we have beene taking in t out workes: Now I come directly t assault this Caſtle in the aire. That whi hath bene ſaid already is ſufficient to pe ſwade any man, who is not brimme f of prejudice and partiality: The other fi reaſons which follow next, have power t compell all men, and command their aſſen

My fixth reaſon is taken from the diam trall oppoſitiõ which is betweene this fab lous relation of the *Nagges head* Ordinatio and all the Recordes of *England*, both Ecc ſiaſticall and civill. Firſt for the time. T Romaniſts ſay, that this Ordination was be fore the ninth of *September* Ann. 2559 b it is apparent by all the Recordes of t Chancery, all the diſtinct Letters Pate or Commiſſions for their Reſpective Co firmations, and Conſecrations, whereupo they were conſecrated, did iſſue out lon after; namely, Arch Bishop *Parkers* Lette Patents (which were the firſt) upon the ſixt day of *December* following. Next th

Com

ommiſſions for *Grindall*, *Cox* and *Sands*;
hen for *Bullingham*, *Iewel*, and *Davis*.
hen for *Bentham* and *Barkley*: and
the yeare following for *Horn*, *Al-*
y, *Scambler*, and *Pilkinton*. He that hath
mind to ſee the Copies of theſe Commiſſi-
s, may find them Recorded *Verbatim* *Rot.*
thin the Rolles of the Arch Bishops Re- *pars* 14.
ſter, and in the Rolles of the Chancery. 2. *El.*
o what end were all theſe Letters Patents,
authoriſe ſo many Confirmatiõs and Con-
crations, if the Conſecrations were done
d paſt long before? No mans Election
n be confirmed in *England*, but by virtue
the Kings Letters Patents. Therefore
e Letters Patents muſt precede the Confir-
ation and Conſecration, not follow after
hree moneths, or foure moneths, or ſix
oneths, and in ſome of thẽ above a yeare.
nd as by the Recordes of the Chancery,
their relation is proved to be a notorious
ble, by all the Eccleſiaſticall Recordes;
ſt of their ſeverall and diſtinct Confirma-
ons, which purſued their Commiſſions
nctually; Then of their ſeverall and di-
inct Conſecrations which purſued their
onfirmations punctually. He who deſireth
ſee theſe, may finde Authentick Recordes
them all, both Confirmations and Conſe-
crations

tions, in the Regiſter of the Arch Bisho
of *Canterbury*. It is not the forging of o
Recorde that would ſerve the turne: E
ther all theſe Recordes muſt be forged, o
the *Nagges head* Ordination is a ſilly ſen
leſſe fable.

Laſtly after the Conſecration followe
the Inſtallement or Inthroniſation, whic
is to be found in the Regiſter of the Dea
and Chapiter: And the Reſtitution of t
new Bishop to his Temporalties by virt
of the Kings Writ, mentioning the Co
firmation and oath of fealty to the King,
being temporall things. Obſerve ho
every one of theſe do purſue anothe
Arch Bishop *Parkers* Commiſſion iſſue
December the ſixth, his Confirmation fo
lowed *December* the ninth, his Conſecr
tion *December* the ſeventeenth, his Inthro
niſation forthwith, and the Reſtitution t
his temporalties the firſt of *March* enſue
ing, that is, at the later end of the ver
next terme: But by their Relation, th
Conſecration was long before the Electio
was confirmed, which can not be; Th
Letter Patents to licenſe the Confirmatio
and Conſecration, come out three moneth
after the Conſecration was done, which i
incredible. As for the Confirmation, M

Ne

ale who was their contriver, knew not hat it was. The inſtallement followed ree moneths after the Conſecration, and e Reſtitution to the Temporalties ſix moths after; which have no probability.

Thus for the time, next for the place. heir lying Relation ſaith, the elected Biops were conſecrated at the *Nagges head*: ll the Eccleſiaſticall Recordes ſay they ere conſecrated at *Lambeth*. The Kings ommiſſion injoineth a legall Conſecraon according to the forme preſcribed by w: Such a legall Conſecration ours at *Lambeth* was; Such a legall Conſecration heirs at the *Nagges head* was not, neither or the place, nor for the rites, nor for he eſſentialls of Conſecration. And without good aſſurance that the Conſecraion was legall, neither the perſon conſecrated could have bene inthroned, nor made is oath of fidelity to the King, nor have bene reſtored to his Temporalties: but he was inthroned, and did his fealty, and was reſtored to his temporalties, that is as much s to ſay, that his Conſecration was legally performed at *Lambeth*, not illegally at the *Nagges head*.

Thirdly for the Conſecrater. That fabulous Relation feigneth that there was but one

one Consecrater, or at the most two: the authentick Recordes of the Church of *England* testifie, that there were foure Consecraters. The Letters Patents require that there should be four Consecraters, and without an authentick Certificate that there were four Consecraters, the Kings Writ for restitution had not issued.

They feine that they imposed hands mutually, *Scory* upon them and they upon *Scorie*: But the Recordes witnesse that *Scory* was solemnely ordeined Bishop in *King Edwards* time, the thirteenth day of *August* Anno. 1551, by the Arch Bishop of *Canterbury*, the Bishop of *London* and the Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*; and needed not to be reordeined at the *Nagges head*.

Reg. Cran. fol. 334.

Lastly, for the persons consecrated, some of them feine that all the elected Bishops, and all of them say that many of them, were consecrated together at one time with Arch Bishop *Parker*: But all the Recordes both Civill and Ecclesiasticall do testifie the contrary, that they had severall Commissions, severall Confirmations, severall Consecrations, upon severall daies, in severall moneths, in several yeares, severall Consecraters; as appeareth most evidently not onely by the Authentick Recordes of the See of *Canterbury*, but also by the Recordes

of

he Chancery, And particularly by the erall Commiſſions directed expreſly to chBishop *Parker*, as a Bishop actually nſecrated, for the Conſecration of all reſt, the three firſt of which Commiſns orLetters Patents beare date the eighnth of *December* An:1559, that is the very xt day after ArchBishop *Parkers* Conration; for theConfirmationand Conſeation of *Grindall*, *Coxe*, and *Sands*, three of oſe elected Bishops. He that doubteth of e truth of theſe Letters Patents, may find em recorded *verbatim*, both in the Archshops Regiſtry, and in the Rolles. If ey were confirmed and conſecrated by rch-Bishop *Parker*, then they were not nſecrated together with Arch-Bishop *rker*, as in that lyng relation is affirmed. nd with this their ſubſequent Inſtalleents and Reſtitutions do exactly agree. ther all the Recordes of *England* muſt be lſe, or this ſilly fable of the *Nagges head* a prodigious forgery.

Thus we have ſeene how the Recordes *The ſeEngland*, civill and Eccleſiaſticall, do con- *venth* adict this tale of a tub. My ſeventh rea- *Reaſon.* ſon sheweth how the ſame Recordes do onfirme and Eſtablish our relation. We

 ſay

ſay firſt (that the See of *Canterbury* be
voide by the death of Cardinall *Pole*, (w
The ſe- died as ſome ſay the very ſame day w
venth Queene *Mary*, others ſay the day fol
reaſon. wing,) the Queene granted her *conge d'e*
to the Deane and Chapiter of *Canterbury*
chuſe an Arch-Bishop. This is cle
proved by the authentick Copy of the *co*
Rot. *d'eslire* itſelf in the Rolles. *Regina dile*
pa. 6. *ſibi in Chriſto Decano & Capitulo Eccleſiæ M*
1. Eliſ. *tropolitica Cantuarienſis ſalutem &c.*

Examinatur

RICHARD BROUGHTON.

Secondly we ſay, that the Deane and ch
piter having received this licenſe, d
chuſe Doctor *Mathew Parker* for th
Arch-Bishop. This is apparent by t
Queenes Commiſſion for his Confirmati
and Reſtitution, wherein there is this clau
And the ſaid Deane and Chapiter, by vir
of our licenſe, have choſen our beloved in Ch
Mathew Parker Profeſſor of Theology,
Arch-Bishop and Paſtour to them and
aforeſaid Church, as by their letters Pat
directed to us thereupon it appeareth m
fully.

Third

Thirdly the Queene accepting this Ele-
on, was graciouſly pleaſed to iſſue out
o Commiſſions for the legall Confirma-
n of the ſaid Election, and conſecrating
the ſaid Arch-Bishop. The former
ed the ninth of *September* Anno 1559,
rected to ſix Bishops, *Cuthbert* Bishop of
rham, *Gilbert* Bishop of *Bath*, *David*
hop of *Peterburough*, *Anthony* Bishop
Landaff, *William Barlow* Bishop, and
n Scory Bishop, in theſe words.

Eliſabeth dei gratia Angliæ &c.
verendis in Chriſto Patribus Cuth-
rto Epiſcopo Dunelmenſi, Gilberto
thonienſi Epiſcopo, Davidi Epiſcopo
rgi Sancti Petri, Anthonio Landa-
nſi Epiſcopo, VVillelmo Barlo Epi-
po, & Iohanni Scory Epiſcopo, Salu-
m. Cum vacante nuper Sede Archi-E-
ſcopali Cantuarienſi per mortem na-
ralem Domini Reginaldi Pole Cardi-
lis, ultimi & immediati Archi-Epi-
pi & Paſtoris ejuſdem, ad humilem
itionem Decani & Capituli Eccleſiæ
ſtræ Cathedralis & Metropoliticæ
riſti Cantuarienſis, eiſdem per literas
ſtras patentes licentiam conceſſerimus

Ro: Pars 2. 1. Eliſ.

alium sibi eligendi in Archiepiscopu
& Pastorem Sedis prædictæ. Ac iidc
Decanus & Capitulum vigore & obte
tu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum n
bis in Christo Magistrum Matthæ
Parker Sacræ Theologiæ Professorem
bi & Ecclesiæ prædictæ elegerint in A
chiepiscopum & Pastorem, prout per l
teras suas patentes Sigillo eorum co
muni sigillatas, nobis inde directas, pl
nius liquet & apparet. Nos electione
illam acceptantes, eidem electioni Re
um nostrum assensum adhibuimus pa
ter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenc
præsentium significamus. Rogantes,
in fide & dilectione quibus nobis ten
mini firmiter præcipiendo mandante
quatenus eundē Magistrum Matthæ
Parker in Archepiscopum & Pastore
Ecclesiæ Cathedralis & Metropolitic
Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ, sic
præfertur electum, electionemque pr
dictam confirmare, & eundem Mag
strum Matthæum in Archiepiscopu
& Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecr
re, cæteraque omnia & singula perage
qu

vestro in hac parte incumbant offi-
Pastorali, juxta formam Statutorum
ea parte editorum & provisorum,
itis cum effectu. In cujus rei testi-
nium &c. Teste Regina apud Red-
ve, nono die Septembris Anno Regni
sabethæ Angliæ &c. primo.

Per breve de privato Sigillo.

Examinatur R I: BROVGHTON.

Now if any man desire a reason why
s first Commission was not executed,
e best accounnt I can give him is this,
at it was directed to six Bishops, with-
t an [*aut minus, or at the least foure of you*]: so
f any one of the six were sick or absent,
refused, the rest could not proceed to
nfirme, or Consecrate. And that some
them did refuse, I am very apt to belee-
, because three of them not long after
re deprived. But the Reader may note,
st that there were three Protestant Bi-
ops in that First Commission. They who
re such punctuall observers of the law of
gland, that they would not proceed to
nsecrate without a fourth, in the va-

cancy of both the Archiepiſcopall Se
certeinly would never give way to a
vate profane Ordination at the *N*
head, by one ſingle Bishop. And ſecon
that for all their pretended intelligen
our English Romish writers are g
ſtrangers to the true paſſages of thoſe ti
knowing nothing but what they hear
Rome, or *Rhemes*, or *Doway*. If it w
otherwiſe we should have heard of
Commiſſion ſooner.

The ſecond Letters Patents which w
executed, were dated the ſixth of *Dec*
ber following, directed to *Anthony*
shop of *Landaff*, *William Barlow* ſometi
Bishop of *Bath*, now Elect Bishop
Chiceſter, *Iohn Scory* ſometimes Bisho
Chicheſter, now Elect Bishop of *Here*
Miles Coverdale ſometimes Bishop
Exceter, *Richard* Suffragan Bishop
Bedford, *Iohn* Suffragan Bishop of *T*
ford, and *Iohn Bale* Bishop of *Oſſory* in *I*
land, in theſe words.

Regina &c. Reverendis in Chri
Patribus Anthonio Landavenſi Epi
copo, *Willelmo Barlow quondam B*
thonienſi Epiſcopo, nunc Ciceſtrenſi E

, *Iohanni Scory quondam Ciceſtrenſi*
iſcopo , nunc Electo Herefordienſi,
iloni Coverdale quondam Exonienſi
iſcopo, Richardo Bedfordenſi, Iohanni
edfordenſi , Epiſcopis Suffraganeis,
anni Bale Oſſorienſi Epiſcopo, Salu-
m. Cum vacante nuper Sede Ar-
iepiſcopali Cantuarienſi per mortem
turalem Domini Reginaldi Pole Car-
inalis , ultimi & immediati Archiepi-
opi & Paſtoris ejuſdem, ad humilem
titionem Decani & Capituli Eccleſiæ
oſtræ Cathedralis & Metropoliticæ
hriſti Cantuarienſis, eiſdem per Lite-
as noſtras Patentes licentiam conceſſe-
imus alium ſibi Eligendi in Archiepi-
copum & Paſtorem Sedis prædictæ,
Ac iidem Decanus & Capitulum vi-
gore & obtentu Licentiæ noſtræ prædictæ,
dilectum nobis in Chriſto Magiſtrum
Matthæum Parker Sacræ Theologiæ
Profeſſorem, ſibi & Eccleſiæ prædictæ Ele-
gerunt in Archi-Epiſcopum & Paſtorem,
prout per Literas ſuas patentes nobis inde
directas plenius liquet & apparet. Nos

electionem illam acceptantes, eidem el
ctioni Regium noſtrum aſſenſum adh
buimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vo
bis tenore præſentium ſignificamus. R
gantes ac in fide & dilectione quibus N
bis tenemini firmiter præcipiendo ma
dantes, quatenus vos aut minus quatu
veſtrum, eundem Matthæum Parker
Archi-Epiſcopum & Paſtorem Eccle
Cathedralis & Metropoliticæ Chri
Cantuarienſis prædictæ ſicut præferu
Electum, electionemq; prædictam Co
firmare, & eundem Magiſtrum Ma
thæum Parker in Archi-Epiſcopum &
Paſtorem Eccleſiæ prædictæ conſecrare
Cæteraque omnia & ſingula peragere
quæ veſtro in hac parte incumbant of
ficio Paſtorali, juxta formam ſtatuto
rum in ea parte editorum & proviſorum
velitis cum effectu. Supplentes nihilo
minus ſuprema Authoritate noſtra Re
gia, ex mero motu & certa Scientia no
ſtris, ſi quid aut in his quæ juxta man
datum noſtrum prædictum per vos fient,
aut in vobis, aut veſtrum aliquo, con
ditione, Statu, facultate veſtris, ad

præ-

ramiſſa perficienda deſit aut deerit eo-
um, quæ per ſtatuta hujus Regni noſtri
ut per leges Eccleſiaſticas in hac parte
equiruntur, aut neceſſaria ſunt, tem-
oris ratione & rerum neceſſitate id poſ-
ulante. In cujus Rei &c. Teſte Regina
pud VVeſtmonaſteriū ſexto die Decem-
ris, Anno Regni Reginæ Eliſabeth An-
liæ &c. Secundo.

Examinatur.

R I: BROUGHTON.

Before I proceed further, to prevent cavills, I muſt acquainte the Reader, that the Suffragan Biſhop of *Bedford* is miſnamed *Richard* in the Rolles; by what miſtake or errour, after ſo long time it is folly to inquire. We may Conjecture how it might eaſily, and moſt probably did come to paſſe: but to ſay poſitively how it did come to paſſe, whether it was the errour of the tranſcriber, or the miſtake of him who gave the inſtructions, or it was no faulte at all, (he might have two names, as many have had, and many have

have and owne them ſeverally,) is not poſſible. In the Eccleſiaſticall Regiſter of the Church, he is alwaies ſtiled by his right name *John*, throughout all the Acts of the Confirmation and Conſecration of Arch Bishop *Parker*. Once his name had been written *Richard*, but it was corrected, and my friend aſſureth me, that it is the onely word in that long narration which is erpunged or interlined; So exact is that Recorde. This is certeine, his right name was *Iohn*, as it is in the Regiſter. To this the Recordes of his own Conſecration, and twenty other Recordes do beare witneſſe.

But as to the validity of the Act or Ordination, it is not materiall whether his name were *Iohn* or *Richard*, or both, or neither. So he was truely ordeined himſelf, and did truely concurre in ordeining, it is no matter how he is Stiled in the Commiſſion, or in the Regiſter. Regall Commiſſions are no eſſentialls of Ordination. Notariall Acts are no eſſentialls of Ordination. The miſnaming of the Baptiſer in a Parish Regiſter doth not make voide the Baptiſme. When Popes do conſecrate themſelves, (as they do ſometimes), they do it by the names of *Paul*, or *Alexander* or

Vrbanus

rbanus, or *Innocentius*: yet theſe are not he names which were impoſed upon them t their Baptiſmes, or at their Confirma- ons, but ſuch names as themſelves have een pleaſed to aſſume. But to come to nore ſerious matter.

There are two differences betweene heſe two Commiſſions. The firſt is an *aut minus; Or at the leaſt foure of you*], which lauſe is prudently inſerted into all Com- miſſions, where many Commiſſioners are amed, leaſt the ſickneſſe, or abſence, or neglect of any one or more, might hinder he worke. The queſtion is, why they are limited to foure, when the Canons of the Catholick Church require but three. The anſwer is obvious, becauſe the Statutes of *England* do require foure in caſe one of the Conſecraters be not an Arch Biſhop, or deputed by one. Three had bene enough to make a valide Ordination, yea to make a Canonicall Ordination; and the Queene might have diſpenſed with her owne lawes: but ſhe wonld have the Arch *B*iſhop to be ordeined both according to the canons of the Catholick Church, and the known lawes of England.

The ſecond difference betweene the two Commiſſions is this, that there is a *Sup-*

plenes

plentes in the later Commiſſion, which is not in the former. [*Supplyng by our Soveraigne authority all defects either in the Execution, or in the Executers of this Commiſſion, or any of them*]. The Court of *Rome* in ſuch like inſtruments have ordinarily ſuch diſpenſative clauſes, for more abundant caution, whether there be need of them or not, to *relaxe all ſentences cenſures, and penalties inflicted either by the law or by the Iudge.*

But ſtill the queſtion is, to what end was this clauſe inſerted? I anſwer, it is end enough, if it ſerve (as the Court of *Rome* uſeth it,) for a certeine ſalve to helpe any latent impediment, though there be none. A ſuperfluous clauſe doth not vitiate a writing. Some thinke it might have reference to Bishop Coverdales *ſyde woollen gowne*, which he uſed at the Conſecration *toga lanea talari utebatur*. That was uncanonicall indeed, and needed a diſpenſation for him that uſed it, not for him who was conſecrated. But this was ſo ſlender a defect and ſo farre from the heart or eſſence of Ordinatiõ; eſpecially where the three other Cõſecraters, (which is the canonicall number) where formally and regularly habited, that it was not worth an intimation under

the

e great ſeale of *England*. This *Miles Co-*
rdale had been both validely and legally
deined Bishop, and had as much power
ordeine as the Bishop of *Rome* himſelf.
he had been Roman Catholick in his
dgment, he had been declared by Car-
nall *Pole* as good a Bishop, as either *Bon-*
r, or *Thirleby*, or any of the reſt.

Others thinke, this clauſe might have
lation to the preſent condition of Bishop
arlow and Bishop *Scory*, who were not
et inthroned into their new Bishopricks.
might be ſo, but if it was, it was a great
iſtake in the Lawiers who drew up the
ommiſſion. The Office and the Bene-
ce of a Bishop are two diſtinct things;
Ordination is an act of the Key of Order,
nd a Bishop uninthroned may ordeine as
ell as a Bishop inthroned. The Ordi-
ation of Suffragan Bishops, who had no
eculiar Bishoprickes, was alwaies admit-
ed and reputed as good in the Catho-
ick Church, (if the Suffragans had
piſcopall Ordination,) as the Ordi-
ation of the greateſt Bishops in the
olrd.

But ſince this clauſe doth extend it ſelf
oth to the Conſecration and the Conſe-
raters, I am confident that the onely
ground

ground of it was that ſame exception, o
rather cavill which Bishop *Bonner* did afte
wards make againſt the legality of Bish
Hornes Conſecration; which is all that e
ther *Stapleton* or any of our Adverſaries h
to pretend againſt the legality of the O
dination of our firſt Proteſtant Bishops
that *they were not ordeined accordi*
to the præſcript of our very Statutes.

I have ſet downe this caſe formerly in m
replication to the Bishop of *Chalcedo*
But to avoide wrangling, I will put i
downe in the very wordes of the Statut
King Edward the Sixth in his time b
authority of Parliament, cauſed the book
of Common Praier and Adminiſtratio
of Sacraments and other Rites and Ce-
remonies in the Church of England, t
be made and ſet forth, not onely for on
uniforme Order of Service, Commō Pray-
er, and Adminiſtration of Sacraments
to be uſed whithin this Realme, but alſ
did adde and put to the ſaid booke, a very
godly Order manner and forme, how
Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Prieſts, Dea-
cons and Miniſters, ſhould from time
t

time be consecrated, made, and or-
red, within this Realme. Afterwards it followeth, that in *the time of Queene Mary, the severall Acts and Statutes made in the secod, third, fourth, fifth and sixth yeares of King Edward, for the authorising and allowing of the said booke of Common praier and other the premisses, were repealed.* Lastly the statute addeth, that *by an Act made in the first yeare of Queene Elisabeth, intituled An act for the uniformity of Common prayer and service in the Church, and administration of Sacraments, the said booke of Common Prair and Administration of Sacraments, and other the said Orders Rites and Ceremonies before mētioned, and all things therein conteined, is fully stablished and authorised to be used in all places within the Realme.*

This is the very case related by the Parliament. Now the exception of Bishop *Bonner*, and *Stapleton*, and the rest, was this. *The booke of Ordination* was expressly stablished by name by *Edward* the Sixth,

And

And that Act was expresly repealed b
Queene Mary: But *the booke of Ordinat*
was not expresly restored by Queene E
sabeth, but onely in generall termes und
the name and notion of the Booke of Co
mon Praiers and administration of Sacr
ments, and other orders rites and Cerem
nies. Therefore they who were ordein
according to the said forme of Ordinati
in the beginning of Queene *Elisabeths* tim
were not legally ordeined. And those B
shops which had bene ordeined accordi
to that forme in King *Edwards* time, thou
they were legally ordeined then, yet th
were not legall *B*ishops now, because Que
Maries statute was still in force, a
was not yet repealed.

Is this all? Take courage Reader, He
is nothing that toucheth the validity of o
Ordination, but onely the legality of i
which is easily satisfied. First I answe
that Queene *Maries* Statute was repeale
sufficiently, even as to rhe booke of Or
dination; as appeareth by the very word
of the Statute which repealed it. *An*
that the said booke, with the order of Service a
of the administration of Sacraments rites a
Ceremonies, shall be after the feast of St. Iob
Baptist next in full force and effect, any thing i

Queen

ueene *Maries* Statute of repeale *to the con-*
ry in any wiſe not withſtanding. That the
ooke of Ordination was a part of this
ooke, and printed in this booke in King
dwards daies, beſides the expreſſe teſti-
ony of the Statute in the eighth of Queene
liſabeth we have the authority of the Ca-
ons of the Church of *England*, which call
ſingularly *the booke of Common Praier, and*
Ordering Bishops Prieſts and Deacons. It is *Can.* 36
r forme of praier upon that occaſion, as
uch as our forme of baptiſing, or admi-
ſtring the holy Euchariſt, or our forme
confirming, or marryng, or viſiting
ſick.

Secondly, it is alſo a part of our forme
Adminiſtration of the Sacraments. We
nie not Ordination to be a Sacrament,
ough it be not one of thoſe two Sacra-
ents, which are generally neceſſary to
lvation.

Thirdly, although it were ſuppoſed that
rdination were no Sacrament, nor the
ooke of Ordination a part of the booke of
ommon praier: yet no man can denie that
is a part of our Eccleſiaſticall rites and
remonies, and under that notion ſuffi-
ently authoriſed. Laſtly,
Ejus eſt legem interpretari cujus eſt condere.

They who have legiſlative power to m
a law, have legiſlative power to expo
8. *Elc.* a law. Queene *Eliſabeth* and her Par
cap. 1. ment made the law, Queene *Eliſabeth*
her Parliament expounded the law, by
ſame authority that made it; declaring
under the booke of Common Praier,
forme of Ordination was comprehend
and ought to be underſtood. And ſo end
the grand cavill of Biſhop *Bonner* and D
&or *Sapleton* and the reſt, of the illeg
lity of our Ordination; ſhewing nothi
but this, how apt a drowning cauſe is
catch hold of every reed.

That the *Supplentes* or this diſpenſati
clauſe had Relation to this cavill, (whi
as it did breake out afterwards into an op
controverſy, ſo it was then whiſpered
corners,) is very evident by one clauſe
the Statute: that *for the avoiding of all q*
ſtions and ambiguities that might be objec
againſt the lawfull Confirmations, inveſti
and Conſecrations of any Arch-Biſhops, Biſh
&c. the Queene in her Letters Patents had
onely uſed ſuch words as had bene accuſtomed
be uſed by King Henry and King Edward, b
alſo diverſe other generall wordes, where
her Highneſſ by her Supreme power and auth
rity, hath diſpenſed with all cauſes and doubt

ny imperfection or disability that could be ob-
cted. The end of this clause and that
tatute was the same: And this was the
nely question or ambiguity which was
noved.

Yet although the case was so evident,
nd was so judged by the Parliament, that
he forme of Consecration was compre-
ended under the name and notion of the
ooke of Common praier &c: yet in the
ndictment against Bishop *Bonner*, I do
ommend the discretion of our Iudges,
nd much more the moderation of the Par-
ament. Criminall lawes should be written
ith a beame of the sun, without all
mbiguity.

Lastly, before I leave this third consi-
eration, I desire the Reader to observe
hree things with me. First, that this dis-
ensative neither hath, nor can be construed
o have any reference to any Consecration
hat was already past, or that was acted
y Bishop *Scory* alone; as that silly Conse-
ration at the *Nagges head* is supposed to
ave been.

Secondly, that this dispensative clause
oth not extend at all to the institution of
Christ, or any essentiall of Ordination, nor
o the Canons of the universall Church: but

onely to the Statutes and Eccleſiaſtic lawes of England. *Si quid deſit aut de eorum quæ per Statuta hujus Regni noſtri, per leges Eccleſiaſticas requiruntur.*

Thirdly, that the Commiſſioners authori by theſe Letters Patents cõfirme and co ſecrate Arch Bishop *Parker*, did make uſe this *Supplemes* or diſpenſative power in Confirmation of the Election, which i politicall Act, (as by the words of t Confirmation in the next paragraph sh appeare,) but not in the Conſecratio which is a purely ſpirituall act, and be longeth meerely to the Key of O der.

Fourthly we ſay, that by virtue of the Letters Patents of December the ſixt foure of the Commiſſioners therein name did meete in *Bowes* Church, upon th ninth day of the ſame moneth: and the and there with the adviſe of the chiefe Ec cleſiaſticall Lawiers of the Kingdome, th Deane of the Arches, the Iudges of th Prerogative and Audience, did ſolemnel confirme the election. This is prove by the Recorde of the Confirmatio or definitive ſentence it ſelf, in theſe words.

In Dei nomine, Amen. Nos Wil-
lmus quondam Bathonienſis & VVel-
nſis Epiſcopus nunc Ciceſtrenſis Elec-
s, Iohannes Scory quondam Ciceſtren-
Epiſcopus nunc Electus Hereforden-
s, Milo Coverdale quondam Exo-
ienſis Epiſcopus, & Iohannes Bedford
piſcopus Suffraganeus, Mediantibus
teris Commiſſionalibus Illuſtriſſimæ
eginæ fidei Defenſatricis &c. Commiſſi-
arij, cum hac clauſula videlicet [unà
m Iohanne Thetfordenſi Suffraganeo
Iohanne Bale Oſſorienſi Epiſcopo],
t etiam cum hac clauſula [Quatenus
os aut ad minus quatuor veſtrum], Nec
on & hac adjectione [Supplentes nihil
minus &c.] ſpecialiter & legitime
eputati, &c. Idcirco nos Commiſſio-
arii Regii antedicti, de & cum aſſenſu
uriſperitorum cum quibus in hac parte
ommunicavimus, prædictam Electionẽ
uprema Authoritate dictæ Dominæ no-
ræ Reginæ nobis in hac parte Commiſſa
onfirmamus. Suppletes ex Suprema Au-
horitate Regia, ex mero principis motu
& certa Scientia nobis delegata, quic-

quid in hac electione fuerit defectum. Tum in his quæ juxta mandatum nobis creditum a nobis factum & processum est aut in nobis aut aliquo nostrum, conditione, Statu, facultate ad hæc perficienda deest aut deerit. Tum etiam eorum quæ per statuta hujus Regni Angliæ, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requisita sunt aut necessaria, prout temporis ratio & rerum præsentium necessitas id postulant, per hanc nostram sententiam definitivam, sive hoc nostrum finale decretum &c.

I cite this the more largely, that our Adversaries may see what use was made of this dispensation, which they cavill so much against: But in the Consecration which is the act of the Key of order, they made no use at all of it. This is likewise clearly proved by the Queenes mandate for the restitution of Arch Bishop *Parker* to his Temporalties, wherein there is this clause. [*Quidem electioni & personæ sic Electæ Regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus & favorem, ipsique fidelitatem nobis debitam pro dicto Archi-Episcopatu recepimus.*]

Rot. pars 14. 2. El.

Fifthly, we say that eight daies after the

Con

onfirmation, that is to say the 17. of ecember Anno 1559, the same Commiſ-oners did proceed to the Conſecration Arch Bishop *Parker*, in the Archi-Epi-opall *Chappell* at *Lambeth*, according to e forme preſcribed by the Church of En-land, with ſolemne Praiers and Sermon, nd the holy Eucharist; at which great umbers of grave perſons communicated ith him at that time, [*frequens graviſſimo-um hominum cætus.*] This is proved evi-ently by the authentick Recordes of the Conſecration, as they are ſtill and alwaies ave been to be ſeen, in the publick Re-giſtry of the Archi-Epiſcopall See of *Can-erbury*.

Regiſtrum Reverendiſſimi in Chriſto Patris & Domini, Domini Matthæi Parker &c. Principio Sacellum tapetibus ad Orientem adornabatur, ſolum vero panno rubro inſternebatur, &c. And ſo firſt ſetting downe both how the Chappell was adorned for the Conſecration, and what habit and garments as well the Conſecraters as the perſon who was to be conſecrated did weare, both at the Praiers and Sermon, as likewiſe at the holy Sacrament and Conſecration, it proceedeth to the Conſecration itſelf. Reg. Park: t. 1. f. 2.

Finito tandem Evangelio, Hereforden
Electus, Bedfordenſis Suffraganeus,
Milo Coverdale Archiepiſcopum cor
Ciceſtrenſi Electo apud menſam in C
thedra ſedente his verbis adduxerun
Reverende in Deo Pater hunc viru
pium pariter atque doctnm tibi offer
mus atque præſentamus, ut Archiepi
copus conſecretur. Poſtquam hæc dixi
ſent, proferebatur ilico regium Dipl
ma ſive Mandatum pro conſecration
Archi Epiſcopi, quo per Dominum Doct
rem Yale legum Doctorem perlecto, Su
cramentum de Regio primatu ſive ſupre
ma ejus authoritate tuenda, juxta ſta
tuta primo anno Regni Sereniſſimæ Re
ginæ noſtræ Elizabethæ edita & promul
gata, ab eodem Archi-Epiſcopo exige
batur. Quod cum ille ſolemniter tu
ctis corporaliter ſacris Evangeliis, con
ceptis verbis præſtitiſſet, Ciceſtrenſis
Electus populum ad orationem hortatus
ad Letanias decantandas Choro reſpon
dence ſe accinxit. Quibus finitis, poſ
queſtiones aliquot Archi-Epiſcopo per

Ciceſtren-

iceſtrenſem Electum propoſitas, & poſt rationes & ſuffragia quædam juxta formam libri authoritate Parliamenti editi coram deum habita, Ciceſtrenſis, Herefordenſis, Suffraganeus Bedfordenſis, & Miles Coverdallus, manibus Archiepiſcopo impoſitis, dixerunt, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, & excitare memineris gratiam Dei quæ in te eſt per manuum impoſitionem. Dedit enim nobis Deus Spiritum non timoris, ſed Potentiæ, Charitatis, & Sobrietatis, &c.

This is ſo evident that our Adverſaries have nothing to ſay, but to crie the Recordes are forged. Forgery of Recordes is a grievous crime, and ought to be manifeſtly proved, or the accuſer to ſuffer for his Calumny. Let them tell us who forged them, and when and where they were forged. But they know nothing of it. Did any of the ſucceding Proto-Notaries complaine that they were forged? or ſo much as an under Clerke of the Office, or any man that had once occaſion to view them, and afterwards found ſome change in them?

No

No ſuch thing. Examine all the Officers and Notaries and Clerkes living, whether ever they obſerved any change in them during their remembrance; And they will all anſwer, No. And ſo would all their predeceſſors ſince Arch-Bishop *Parkers* time have anſwered, if they had beē put to their Oathes. Who are they then that accuſe them of Forgery? They are the Adverſaries of the Church of *England*, who never read one word of them, nor know much what belongeth to ſuch Recordes: But they wish if they be not forged, that they were forged. What would you have men do? If they could anſwer them otherwiſe they would; But they can not, and therefore they crie them downe as forged.

It is poſſible to forge private Acts done in a corner: But to forge a conſecration done publickly at *Lambeth*, in Queene *Elizabeths* time, And to forge it ſo early as this was published to the world, is incredible. Surely theſe Fathers do not know the Cuſtomes of the Church, that all things which are done at publick Conſecrations, are preſently drawne into Acts by principall Notaries, and kept in publick Regiſtries, and the cuſtody of them committed to ſworne Officers. And this practiſe was not be-

gu

in *England* upon this occaſion, but
h beẽ obſerved throughout both Provin-
for time immemoriall. I ſhould not
ſt one Penfull of inke upon an Engliſh
n, who either doth know or ought to
w what credit the law of *England* doth
e to theſe Recordes: *But* for the ſatis-
tion of ſtrangers who are miſled by
h bold calumnies, I will take leave for
ce to prove that, which like the common
nciples of Artes, ought to be taken for
anted, and *De quo nefas eſt dubitare.*
t us trie whether they can ſay more for
e *Vatican* Recordes, then we can for
eſe.

For the preſent, I produce ſix grounds
convince all thoſe who gainſay them,
he firſt is that value and reſpect which
e *Lawes* of the Kingdome do give them,
at is to allow them to be authentick
oofes; Eſpecially in caſes of this nature,
ncerning Spirituall Acts belonging to
e Key of Order. If a Clerke have loſt
s Letters of Orders, a certificate out
f this Regiſtrie, under the Seale of the
rch-Bihop, or the hand of the Protono-
ry, is an authentick proofe. Shall
wo or three Adverſaries, who are ſtrangers

and

and know little of our affaires, altogeth
unacquainted with our Lawes and R
cordes, dare without any ground to defa
that for forged, which the Lawes of t
Kingdome do allow for authentick? Eith
these Recordes are authentick, or Ch
stendome never had an authentick E
clesiasticall Record. The very A
of our Synods or Convocations are n
more undoubted, then these are.

My second proofe is taken from t
credit of the Publick Notaries, who d
testifie this individuall Consecration, a
draw it up into Acts. The Testimony o
two publick Notaries, for matter of fa
maketh full proofe over all *Europe*; but he
at least foure Publick Notaries we
present at this Consecration, and testifie
the truth of these Acts; Whereof two o
them were the Principall Publick Notari
in *England*, that is, *Anthony Huse* proto no-
tary of the See of *Canterbury*, and *Thom*
Argall Registerer of the Prerogative Cour
assisted in actuating this Consecration, b
Thomas Willet and *Iohn Iucent* Pnblick No-
taries. Who can make doubt of a ma
ter of fact so attested?

B

But is it further Obſervable that theſe oure publick Notaries were the ſame who id draw Cardinall *Poles* Conſecration into &s, and atteſt them. Either let theſe athers denie that Cardinall *Pole* was onſecrated, or let them grant that Archiſhop *Parker* was Conſecrated. *Aut ramque negare, aut utrumque concedite.* here are the ſame Proofes for the one and or the other. There needeth no more to e done to ſatisfie any man that hath eyes his head, but to compare the one Regier with the other,

We owe a third ground to the Queenes xtraordinary care, who was ſo ſolicitous eaſt ſome Circumſtance in the Politicall art might be defective in ſome *punctilio* f law, by reaſon of the frequent change f the Statutes in the reignes of her Father, rother, Siſter, and Her ſelf, that she caued the Letters Patents to be carefully peuſed by ſix of our moſt eminent Lawiers, ho all with one unanimous conſent did ertifie, that the Commiſſion was good in w, and that the Conſecraters might roceed legally to Conſeeration upon ; which Certificate ſubſcribed with their

their owne hands is preſerved in the R
cordes. So if theſe Recordes be forg
not onely the Acts of the Principall No
ries of *England*, but alſo the hands
the Principall Lawiers of *England* m
be forged for company, which is inc
dible.

The fourth ground is irrefragable, t
ken from the teſtimony and authority
the Parliament of *England*, in the eig
yeare of Queen *Eliſabeth*, that was abo
ſix yeares after this Conſecration w
acted; which ſpeaking of the great c
was taken in and about the Elections, Co
firmations, and Conſecrations of Arc
Biſhop *Parker*, and the reſt of thoſe fi
Biſhops in Queene *Eliſabeths* time, f
proofe thereof referreth us to theſe ve
Recordes, [*As the Recordes of her Ma
jeſties ſaid Fathers and Brothers tim
and alſo her owne time, will m
plainly teſtifie and declare*]. Doth t
Parliament referre ſubjects to Record
which are forged? You ſee the contrary
that it mentioneth them as authentick, un
doubted, undeniable proofes of what w
really done.

8. *El.* c. 1.

To this unanſwerable reaſon, theſe Fa-
ers pretend to give two anſwers: But
ey are ſuch as are able to ſatisfie any man,
at no anſwer is to be expected. The
ſt anſwer is in their printed booke pag.
6, that *the word Recordes is but a generall*
rme. As if truth ought not to be regarded
generalls; as well as in particnlars. Yet
e termes which are added to *Recordes*,
at is, [*of her Fathers time, her brothers time,*
dher time], are no generall but reſtrei-
ing termes.

They adde, that *it is a word of courſe,*
hich men do rather ſuppoſe then exa-
ine, when they mention things that
ave been practiſed in former times.
hat latitude theſe Fathers may allow
eir *confitents* in caſe Theology for *words of*
ourſe, I do not now examine; but what
ave words of Courſe to do in a printed
w? They might as well tell the Parlia-
ent in plaine termes, that they lied, or
at they ſpake they knew not or regarded
ot what: as tell them that their words
ere but *words of courſe.* If theſe wordes
f courſe were not true, why did not
ey confute them then, when all things
ere freſh in mens memories? No man

can

can beleeve that they did forbeare ou
affection to the Parliament, but bec
they could not then oppose so evid
truth.

Yet they conclude it to be *evident*,
there were no such Recordes of Parkers cons
tion. This is more then words of course,
charge the Parliament directly with an
truth. But how is it evident that th
were no such Recordes? becaus*e they*
never produced to those Roman Catholick D
ctors, who desired to see some evidence of P
kers Consecration. This is wonderf
They were cited in printe, they were
ged by the Parliament in the Publick
wes of the *Kingdome*, of which no
can pleade ignorance; and yet they tel
they were never produced. But to sati
their very pretensions. Their excepti
in those daies were of another natur
either against our English Ordinall,
against the *Legality* of our Bishops; wh
later exception hath been answered alr
dy, and the former shall be answered
due place. The reason why Bishop *Le*
and Bishop *Horne*, and others did not
these Recordes more expressely, was
dread at all least they should be found
be counterfeit, but because they had

ed to cite them, to answer any thing that
s objected against them. Either the
oman Catholick writers of those daies
re false to their owne interest, to smo-
er a thing which (if it had been true)
d been so much to their advantage;
ich no rationall man can imagine: Or
e *Nagges head* Ordination was altogether
knowne and unheard of in those daies;
ich is most certeine.

But now the Fathets change their note,
ld *they not be forged as well in Queene* Eli-
beths *time as in King* Iames *his reigne?*
his is to blow hote and cold with the
ne breath. Before they demanded, *how*
as possible they should be extant then and
produced? Now they tell us, they might
extant then, and yet forged: Nay,
h a dexterity they have in turning all
ich they touch into gold, that they make
s very suppofition that they were extant
n, to be a proofe against us that they
re forged. Therefore they were not
duced, becaufe *in Queene Elifabeths time*
y were living, who would have proved them
e forged.

Obserue first, what honour and respect

our Countrymen do beare to our Prince and Parliaments united. Before they d as good as gave them the lie, And no they make them at the leaſt Acceſſaries forgery, ſo farre as to avouch and juſti forged Recordes. Secondly obſer with what confidence and conſcience th ſay that theſe Recordes were never prod ced: And yet confeſſe that they were ci in Printe, and alleged in our very Statut If Bishop *Iewell* and Bishop *Horne* had ci them, (as they would have cited them they had had occaſion), they could ha done no more then was done. Did a man upon this publication go about to co vince them of forgery? No I warra you, The caſe was too plaine to be co vinced. The Parliament, and the boo of the lifes of the ſeventy Arch Bishops *Canterbury* printed by *Iohn Day Anno* 157 have ſpoiled the Fathers Arguments, [*T were not produced, therefore they were forg* and furnished us with a demonſtrati proofe of the contrary. They were pr duced and cited in printe, and neither co vinced, nor ſo much as accuſed forgery; Therefore they were not fo ged.

It ſeemeth this anſwer did not ſatisf

e Fathers themſelves: and therefore
e one of them hath addeth a ſecond anſ-
er in the margent, with his penne, in
heſe words; *The Act of Parliament*
elates onely to the Recordes of the
Queenes Letters Patents, and not to
he Recordes of the Biſhops Conſecra-
ion or Ordination. They ſay that
loſſe is accurſed which corrupteth and
ontradicteth the text, as this gloſſe
oth egregiouſly. The Statute ſpeaketh
xpreſly, of *the Recordes of Elections and*
onfirmations and Conſecrations, which
re all of them Eccleſiaſticall Acts, and
one of them Recorded in theRolles of
hancery, or any other civill Court of
ecordes, but onely in the Eccleſiaſticall
egiſters of the Arch-Biſhops, Deanes
nd Chapiters reſpectively. This an-
wer is a groundleſſe evaſion.

My fifth ground to prove that theſe Re-
ordes were not forged, is taken from
hat booke of the lifes of the ſeventy ſuc-
eding Arch-Biſhops of *Canterbury*, printed
n *London* in the yeare 1572; wherein the
uthour, (that was Arch Biſhop *Parker*
imſelf,) having deſcribed the Confirma-
ions and Conſecrations of Biſhop *Grindall*,

Bishop *Sands*, Bishop *Iewell*, Bish
Horne, and all the reſt of thoſe firſt Pr
teſtant Bishops, he addeth in the m
gent, *Hæ confirmationes & conſecra
nes in Regiſtris apparent*: "*Theſe confirm
tions and conſecrations de appeare in the Re
ſters.* Then the Regiſters were then exta
and not onely extant but publickly pri
ted, whileſt all things were freſh in me
memories, yet no man did or durſt exce
againſt the truth of them; So free th
were not onely from corruption, but fro
ſuſpicion.

The ſixth and laſt ground to prove th
the Recordes were not forged, is take
from the agreemeut and concurrence o
our civill Recordes (which no man ev
doubted of) with our Eccleſiaſticall Re
giſters. We have ſeene the Queenes Le
ters Patẽts, directed to ſeven other Bishop
for the confirmation and conſecration o
Arch-Bishop *Parker*, dated the ſixth of *De
cember anno* 1559; Therefore upon the ſixth
of *December* 1559 he was neither Confir
med nor Conſecrated. We have ſeene the
Eccleſiaſticall Recordes, how by virtue of
thoſe very Letters Patents, he was confir
med upon the ninth day, and conſecrated
upon the ſeventeenth day of the ſame
Moneth,

beth. We find three other Letters Pa-
ts, directed to Arch-Bishop *Parker* him-
f as a Consecrated Bishop, for the Con-
mation and Consecration of other Bi-
ops; namely *Richard Coxe*, *Edmund Grin-
ll*, and *Edwin Sandes*, dated the Eigh-
enth of *December*, that is the very next
y after his consecration: Therefore he
as then consecrated. And this agreeth
actly with the Ecclesiasticall Regiſter.

*Eliſabeth Dei gratia Angliæ &c. Re-
erendiſſimo in Chriſto Patri & Domino,
Matthæo Archi-Epiſcopo Cantuarienſi,
totius Angliæ Primati & Metropoli-
ano, &c, Salutem. Rogantes, ac in fide
& dilectione quibus nobis tenemini fir-
miter præcipiendo mandantes, quate-
nus eundem magiſtrum Edmundum
Grindall in Epiſcopum & Paſtorem
Eccleſiæ Cathedralis Divi Pauli London
prædictæ ſic ut præfertur Electum, Ele-
ctionemque prædictam Confirmare, &
eundem magiſtrum Edmundum Grin-
dall in Epiſcopum & Paſtorem Eccleſiæ
prædictæ conſecrare, ceteraque omnia
& ſingula peragere, quæ veſtro in hac*

parte

parte incumbunt Officio paſtorali &
Teſte Regina apud Weſtmonaſterium, d
cimo Octavo die Decembris, Anno R
ginæ Elizabeth Angliæ &c. ſecundo.

Examinatur per

RICH: BROUGHTO

Conſimilia Brevia (Eiſdem forma
verbis, mutatis ſolummodo Mutandi
directa ſunt eidem Matthæo Arc
Epiſcopo Cantuarienſi, pro confirma
tione Electionis, & conſecratione E
chardi Cox Sacræ Theologiæ Profeſſo
in Epiſcopum Elienſem, Et Edwi
Sands ſacræ Theologiæ Profeſſoris
Epiſcopum VVigornenſem, Omnia ſ
dato prædicto & in Rotulo ſupradicto.

Examinatur per

RICHARDUM BROUGHTO

There cannot be a clearer proofe in t
world, to prove that Arch-Bishop *Par*
was neither confirmed nor Conſecrat
upon the ſixth of *December* Anno 155
a

nd that he was both Confirmed and Con-
ecrated, and commanded to Conſecrate
thers, upon the eighteenth of the ſame
noneth. Neither doth the King, or Church,
r Lawes of *England*, take notice of any
man as a true Arch-Bishop or Bishop, un-
ill hands be impoſed upon him, but al-
waies with this addition [*Elect*] as in the
booke of Ordination, *Ego I N. Eccleſiæ*
ique ſedis N. Electus Epiſcopus profiteor.
And in the letany, *Te Rogamus ut huic fratri*
oſtro Electo Epiſcopo Benedictionem & gratiam
uam largiri digneris.

Laſtly, by the lawes of *England*, a Bi-
ſhop can not be admitted to do his homage
or ſweare fealty for his Bishoprick, nor
be reſtored to his Temporalties, untill he
be legally Conſecrated: But it is Appa-
rent by the Queenes Letters Patents, dated
the one and twentieth day of *March* follo-
wing, (that was at the end of Hilary terme,
as ſpeedily as could be) he had done his
homage, and was then reſtored to his Tem-
poralties. Which proveth clearly, that
he was legally Conſecrated, that is to ſay,
according to the Regiſter. Such a perpe-
tuall agreement there is, between our Ec-
cleſiaſticall Recordes and our Civill Re-
cordes.

CHAP.

CHAPT. V.

The eighth ninth and tenth reas
against that fabulous relati
from the Authority of our Stat
the booke of the lifes of the Arc
Bishops of Canterbury, and
sorts of witnesses.

The eighth reason.

THe eighth reason to prove the *Nag*
head Ordinatiõ to be a fable, is take
the authority of the Statute in the eigh
yeare of Queene *Elisabeth*, which is th
entituled. *An Act declaring the manner*
making and Consecrating of the Arch-Bish
and Bishops of this Realme, to be good lawf
and perfect. [*An Act declaring*] not ex
cting or making; [the *manner of making a*
Consecrating the Arch Bishops and Bishops
this Realme,] that is, those in the beginnin
of Queene *Elisabeths* time, as appeareth b
the whole body of the Act; [*to be good law*
full and perfect. The title of the Statut
alone is sufficient to confute this fable: Bu
there is much more in the body of the Sta
tute; As where it *approveth the making an*
consecrating of the same Arch Bishops and Bi
shops

shops to be duely and orderly done, according to the lawes of this Realme. If it was done duely and orderly according to the lawes of this Realme, then it was not done at the *Nagges head*, nor after such a silly ridiculous manner, as these Fathers do relate it. That forme differeth from our forme in all things. In the Consecrater, or Minister of the Consecration: We must have three Bishops at the least, there was but one. In the matter: Our matter is Imposition of handes, their matter was the laying the Bible upon the head or shoulders of the person Consecrated. In the forme: Our forme is *receive the holy Ghost* &c, Their forme was, *Take thou Authority to preach the word of God sincerely.*

The Statute proceedeth, that *they were elected made and consecrated Arch Bishops and Bishops, according to such order and forme, and with such Ceremonies in and about their Consecrations, as were allowed and set forth by the said Acts Statutes and Orders, annexed to the said booke of Common praier before mentioned.* This is plaine enough. If the Parliament say truely, then they were

were Conſecrated in a Church, not in a T
verne; not according to the Brainſick wi
ſies of a ſelf conceited Foole, or rat
the ludibrious deviſe of an Archenem
but according to the forme preſcribed
the Church and Kingdome. The Parli
ment had more reaſon to know the tr
then theſe Fathers, for there were pe
ſonally preſent both the perſons who
conſecrate, and the perſons who were co
ſecrated, and many Lords and Gent
men who were eye witneſſes of the con
cration. Chuſe Reader, whether th
wilt truſt the tale of a ſingle, obſcure, ma
cious ſpie, tatling in a corner: or the a
veration of the Parliament of England,
the face of the ſun, published to the wo
in print.

The Parliament teſtifieth further, that
is and may be very evident and appare
that *no cauſe of ſcruple ambiguity or doubt*
or may juſtly be objected, againſt the ſaid El
tions Confirmations or Conſecrations. Do th
thinke the Parliament would have give
ſuch a teſtimony for the Nagges head Co
ſecrations. And ſo they conclude, th
all perſons which had been or ſhould be orde
or conſecrated, after the forme and order proſcri
bed in the ſaid English Ordinall, *were*
ver

ery deed, and by authority of Parliament were declared and enacted to be rightly Ordered and consecrated. The scope of the Parliament ed of this Act, was to confirme the consecration of Arch Bishop *Parker* and the rest f the Bishops, and to free them from cavills and objections: But they confirme o Ordination at the *Nagges head*, neither can their words be extended any way o such a ridiculous Consecration: Therefore the Ordination of ArchBishop *Parker* nd the rest, was no *Nagges head* Ordinatiō.

My ninth reason to prove that *Nagges-ead* Relation fabulous and counterfeit, s taken from the Testimony of that book ormerly mentioned, of the lifes of the seenty Areh Bishops of *Canterbury*; wherein the Consecrations of Arch Bishop *Parker* and all the rest are particulary reated. That which was published to the world in print, above thirty yeares before the death of Queene Elisabeth, was not lately forged: But the legall Ordinations of Arch-Bishop *Parker* and the rest, according to the Register, was published to the world in print, above thirty yeares before the death of Queene Elisabeth. Againe, that which was published to the world in print with the allowance

of

of Arch Bishop *Parker*, or rather by Ar
Bishops Parker himſelf, was not intend
by Arch Bishop *Parker* to be ſmothered
concealed. Men do not uſe to publish th
forgeries in print; eſpecially ſo ſoone, a
of ſuch publick actions, whileſt there
ſo many eye witneſſes living. That
Relation was not confuted, That the A
thour was never called to an account
it, That no man ſtood up againſt the Re
ſters, nor on the behalf of the *Na*
head Ordination in thoſe daies, That
Neale was ſo tame to endure the lie in pr
and all his party ſo ſilent, at that ti
when the truth might ſo eaſily have be
diſcovered, as if it had bene written with
beame of the ſun, (as it was indeed); is
evident proofe that our Relation is und
niable, and the Relation which th
Fathers make is but a drowſy dream
which could not indure the light of t
ſun.

The tenth reaſon. The tenth and laſt reaſon to prove o
Relation true and theirs fabulous, is t
ken from all ſortes of witneſſes, ours a
theirs indifferently. Mr *Maſon* reckone
up ſeven of our writers, who had juſ

d the legality of our Ordinations, and
ed our Regiſters as authentick Recor-
, before himſelf; Biſhop *Jewell*,
hop *Hall*, Biſhop *Goodwin*, Doctor
lings, Mr, *Camden*, Mr. *Shelden*,
d one who was then living when this
eſtion was ſo hotely debated in King
mes his time, and had been an eye-wit-
ſſe of Arch Biſhop *Parkers* Conſecra-
ns at *Lambeth*, that was the *Earle* of
ttingham. One that was, well ſtored
th our English writers in Queene
ſabeths time, might adde many more:
t that can not well be expected from me
this diſtance.

We may produce as many of theirs,
ho have confeſſed or been convinced of
e truth of Arch Biſhop *Parkers* Conſe-
ation. Firſt Mr. *Clerke*, whoſe Father
as Regiſter to Cardinall *Pole* in his Le-
antine Courte, and he himſelf an Actu-
y under him, when *Theophilus Higgins*
d out of England to St. *Omars*, or
oway, (I remember not well whether).
here he met with this Mr. *Clerke*,
ho falling into diſcourſe with him
oncerning his Reaſons why he
had

had forſaken the Church of England, *Higgins* told him, that one of them that ſaying of St. *Hierome*, *It is no C which hath no Prieſts*; reflecting upon *Nagges head* Conſecration. Mr. *Clerke* proved well of his Caution, becau *dubiis tutior pars ſequenda*: but withal wished, that what their Authours had w ten concerning that point, could be m good; confeſſing that he himſelf w England at that time, (The witneſſe not poſitively remember whether a Conſecration or not.) But Mr, *C* ſaid that he himſelf was preſent when Advocate of the Arches, whom the Qu ſent to peruſe the Regiſter after the C ſecration, and to give her an account w ther it was performed Canonically, retu her this anſwer, that *he had per the Regiſter, and that no juſt excep could be made againſt the Conſecrat But* (he ſaid) *ſomething might h been better, particularly that Bi Coverdale was not in his Rochet,* he aſſured her, *that could make no fect in the Conſecration.* Here have, if not an eye witneſſe, yet at lea eare witneſſe in an undoubted manner, of leg

l Conſecration, and of the truth of Regiſter, and of the judgement of the ocate of the Arches, concerning the onicalneſſe of the Conſecration. Thus n *Mr. Higgins* was ready to make faith hileſt he was living, and *Mr. Barwick* ſon of very good credit, from him of is preſent.

he ſecond witneſſe is *Mr. Higgins* him- who comming afterwards into England deſire to ſee the Regiſter, and did , and finding thoſe expreſſe words in it *o vero Coverdallus non niſi toga lanea talari ur*,] and remembring withall what *Clerke* had told him, whereas the Ca- call garments of the reſt of the Bi- s are particularly deſcribed: he was lly ſatisfied of the truth of the Conſe- ion, and lawfull ſucceſſion of our En- Bishops, that he ſaid he never made ot of it afterwards.

y third witneſſe is *Mr. Hart*, a ſtiffe an Catholick, but a very ingenuous ion, who having ſeene undoubted co- of Doctor *Reynolds* his Ordination by op *Freake*, and of Bishop *Freakes* Con- ation by ArchBishop *Parker*, and laſtly rchBishop *Parkers* owne Conſecration: as ſo fully ſatisfied with it, that he him-

ſelf

ſelf did raſe out all that part of the con
rence betweene him and Doctor *Reinol*
My fourth witneſſe is Father *Oldcorne*
Ieſuit. This teſtimony was urged by
in my treatiſe of Schiſme in theſe wo
Theſe authentick evidences being u
occaſion produced, out of our Eccleſia
call Courtes, and deliberately peru
and viewed by Father Oldcorne the
ſuit, he both confeſſed himſelf clearly co
vinced of that whereof he had ſo l
doubted, (that was the legitimate ſu
ceſſion of Biſhops and Prieſts in o
Church) and wiſhed heartily to wa
the reparation of the breach of Chriſte
dome, that all the world were ſo abu
dantly ſatisfied as he himſelf was; bla
ming us as partly guilty of the groſſe m
ſtake of many, for not having publick
and timely made knowne to the world
the notorious falſhood of that empty
but farre ſpread aſperſion againſt o
ſucceſſion: To this the Biſhop of *Chal*
cedon, who was better acquainted wi
the paſſages of thoſe times in England
then any of thoſe perſons whom theſe Fa
then

rs ſtile of *undoubted credit*, makes this
feſſion. *That father Oldcorne being*
hold for the powder treaſon, and
ging others by himſelf, ſhould ſay,
ſe Regiſters to be authentick, is no
rvell, Survey c. 9. p. 122.

A fifth witneſſe is Mr. Wadſworth,
o in an Epiſtle to a freind in England
h teſtifie, that *before he left England he*
d the Conſecration of Arch Bishop Parker
r Regiſters. This made him ſo mode-
e above his fellowes, that whereas ſome
hem tell of five, and the moſt of them
ifteen, which were conſecrated at the
gges head, he ſaith onely that *the con-*
ation of the firſt Proteſtant Bishop was at-
pted there, but not accomplished. If it were
ly attempted not accomplished, then
Nagges head Ordination is a fable.
t it falleth out very unfortunately for Mr
adſworths attempt, that of all thoſe firſt
oteſtant Bishops, whoſe elections were
confirmed at *Bowes* Church about that
e, (And it might be all of them, it is
y probable fundry of them had a confir-
tion dinner at the Nagges head) not one
s confirmed in perſon, but all of
m by their Proxies: Arch Bishop
arker by Doctor *Bullingham*, Bishop
In Ep. ad amic. n. 5.

Barlow and Bishop *Scory* by *Walter* [illegible] Bachelour of Law, Bishop *Grindall* [illegible] *Thomas Hink* Doctor of Law, Bishop [illegible] by *Edward Gascoine*, Bishop *Sands* by [illegible] *mas Bentham*, *&c*; as appeareth by the [illegible] thentick Recordes of their confirmati[illegible] Bishops are ordinarily confirmed by P[illegible] xie, but no man was ever consecrated, [illegible] man was ever attempted to be consecra[illegible] by Proxie.

The four next witnesses are Mr. *Collin*[illegible] *Mr. Laithwait*, *Mr. Faircloth*, *and M*[illegible] *Leake*, two of them of the same order w[illegible] these Fathers; to whom the Arch Bishop [illegible] *Canterbury* caused these Recordes to [illegible] shewed, in the presence of himself, the B[illegible] shops of *London*, *Durham*, *Ely*, *Bath* [illegible] *Welles*, *Lincolne*, and *Rochester*. Th[illegible] viewed the Register, they turned it ov[illegible] and over, and perused it as much as th[illegible] pleased, and in Conclusion gave this se[illegible] tence of it, that *the booke was beyond exc*[illegible] *tion*. To say, that afterwards they desir[illegible] to have the Recordes into prison, to per[illegible] them more fully, is ridiculous. Such R[illegible] cordes may not goe out of the presence [illegible] the Keeper. But these Fathers may [illegible] them as much as they list in the Registri[illegible] if they seeke for satisfaction, not alterc[illegible] tion.

Lastly

Laſtly Bishop *Bonner* had a ſuite with hop *Horne*, and the iſſue was whether hop *Horne* were legall, conſecrated Bi-p; upon that ſcruple, or rather cavill, ich I have formerly mentioned. If Mr. ale who they ſay was Bishop *Bonners* aplein, and ſent on purpoſe to ſpie what bishops did; could have proved the or-ation of Bishop *Horne* at the *Nagges* d, he might not onely have cleared his ſter, but have turned Bishop *Horne* de-vedly out of his Bishoprick. But he s loath to forfeit his eares, by avouching ch a palpaple lie. The *Nagges head* Or-nation was not talked of in thoſe daies. ow should it, before it was firſt deviſed? r. *Sanders* dedicated a booke to ArchBi-op *Parker*, which he called *the Rock of Church*: If the Nagges head Ordination d bene a ſerious truth, how would he ve triumphed over the poore Arch-Bi-op?

To conclude, If faith ought to be given to ncurring Recordes Eccleſiaſticall and vill, of the Church and Kingdome of ngland, If a full Parliament of the whole ingdome deſerve any credit, If the teſti-ony of the moſt eminent publick Nota-es in the Kingdome, If witneſſes without

exception, If the ſilence, or contradict
or confeſſion of knowne Adverſaries,
of any force, If the ſtrongeſt preſumti
in the world may have any place, that
in their right wittes will not ruine th
ſelves willfully, without neceſſity, or h
of advantage, If all theſe grounds put to
ther do over ballance the clandeſtine
lation of a ſingle malicious Spie, with
either oath, or any other obligation: t
I hope every one who readeth theſe grou
will conclude with me, that the Regi
of the Church of England is beyond all
ception, and the malicious Relation of
Nagges head Ordination, a very tale o
tub, and no better; ſo full of Ridicul
folly in it ſelf, that I wonder how a
prudent man can relate it without laug
ter.

Who told this to *Bluet*? *Neale*. Who to
this to *Haberley*? *Neale*. Who told it to t
reſt of the Priſoners at *Wiſbich*? *Nea*
Onely *Neale*. Who ſuggeſted it to *Neal*
The Father of lies. *Neale* made the fabl
Neale related it in Corners, long after t
time it was pretended to be acted. If h
Maiſter Bishop Bonner had knowne an
thing of it, we had heard of it long before
That the Arch-Bishop should leave Lam-
beth

eth to come to London to be conſecrated;
hat he ſhould leave all thoſe Churches
London, which are immediately under
is owne iurisdiction, to chuſe a common
verne, as the fitteſt place for ſuch a worke;
hat Bishop Bonner being deprived of his
iſhoprick, and a priſoner in London,
hould ſend Neale from Oxford, and
nd a command by him to one over whom
e never had any Iuriſdiction; That the
ther Bishop being then a Proteſtant
hould obey him being a Roman Catho-
ck, when there were ſo many Churches
the City to performe that worke in,
here the Bishop of London never pre-
nded any Iuriſdiction; That theſe things
hould be treated, and concluded, and
xecuted all at one meeting; that Bishop
onner did foreſee it would be ſo, And
ommand his ſervant to attend there untill
e ſee the end of that buſineſſe. That the Bi-
hops being about ſuch a Clandeſtine
orke, ſhould ſuffer a knowne enemy
o ſtay all the while in their com-
pany, is incredible. If *Neale* had fei-
ned that he had heard it from one of
he Drawers boies, it had deſerved mo-
e credit, then this ſilly, improbable

inconsistent Relation; which looketh mo
like an heape of fictions made by sever
Authours by starts, then a continued Rel
tion of one man,

Quicquid ostendas mihi sic incredulus odi.

CHAPT. VI.

*The Nagges head Ordination is b
a late devise. Of the Earle of No
tingham, Bishop Bancroft, Do
ctor Stapleton, the Statute* 8. El.
And the Queenes dispensation.

NOw having laid our grounds, in th
next place let us see what the Fathe
have to say further for themselves. *This st
of the* Naggeshead *was first contradicted by M
son in the yeare* 1613: *yet so weakly and fain
that the attentive Reader may easily perceive
feared to be caught in a lie.* First, the Fa
thers seem to argue after this manne
Many Athenian writers did mention th
Cretan Bulls and Minotaurs and Laby
rinth, but no Cretan did write again
them, therefore those ridiculous Fable
were true. Rather, the Cretans laughe

t their womannish revenge, to thinke o repaire themſelves for a beating, with ſcolding and lying: ſuch ridiculous Fictions ought to be entertained with ſcorne and contempt, *Spreta exoleſcunt, ſi iraſcaris agnita videntur.* Secondly, it might be (for any thing I know to the contrary) Mr. *Maſon* was the firſt who diſſected this lie, and laid the falſity of it open to the world: but he was not the firſt who avouched and juſtified the Canonicall Conſecration, and perſonall Succeſſion of our Proteſtant Biſhops, which is the ſame thing in effect; the Biſhop of *Hereford* did it before him, and Doctor *Reynolds* before the Biſhop of *Hereford*, and he that writ the life of Arch-Biſhop *Parker* before Doctor *Reynolds*, and the Parliament before him that writ Arch Biſhop *Parkers* life, and the publick Regiſters of the Church before the Parliament.

Thirdly, they would make us believe that this Fable was ancient, and publiſhed to the world from the beginning of Queen *Eliſabeths* time in print, and unanſwered by the Proteſtants untill the 13, of King *Iames*: but there is no ſuch thing. For their credit, let them produce one Authour that mentioneth it in the beginning of

Queen *Eliſabeths* time, or if they cann doe that, for forty yeares after, that is before the yeare 1600: or otherwiſe t caſe is plain that it is an upſtart lie, newl coined about the beginning of King *Jam* his time; the Fathers would not have a anſwer it before it was coined, or befor it was known to us.

Where they ſay that Mr, *Maſon* di handle this Controverſy *weakly and faintly* they know they doe him wrong: He hat ſo thrashed their Authours, *Fusherbert*, and *Fitz-Simon*, and *Holywood*, and *Conſtable*, and *Kelliſon*, and *Champney*, that the cauſe hath wanted a Champion everſince, until theſe Fathers tooke up the Bucklers. But whereas they adde, that *Mr. Maſon was affraid to be convinced by ſome aged perſons that might then be living, and remember what paſſed in the beginning of Queen* Eliſabeths *reign*; it ſo farre from truth, that *Mr. Maſon* nameth a witneſſe beyoud all exception, that was invited to ArchBishop *Parkers* Conſecration at *Lambeth*, as being his Kinsman, and was preſent there, The Earle of *Nottingham* Lord High Admirall of *England*.

Why

Why did none of their Authors goe to
m, or imploy ſome of their Friends to
quire of him? The caſe is cleare, they
ere more affraid of Conviction, and to be
ught in a lie, then *Mr. Maſon*: who
id not the Foundation of his Diſcourſe
on looſe prittle-prattle, but upon the
rm Foundation of Originall Re-
ords.

They ſay, *in the yeare 1603, none of the roteſtant Clergy durſt call it a fable, as ſome w doe.* I am the man, I did call it ſo, I call it ſo. Such a blind relation as this , of a buſineſſe pretended to be acted in e yeare 1559, being of ſuch conſequence, whereupon the ſucceſſion of the Church *England* did depend, and never publi-ed untill after the yeare 1600, as if the hurch of England had neither Friends or Enemies; deſerveth to be ſtiled *a Tale a Tub* and no better.

They adde; Bancroft *Biſhop of ondon being demanded by Mr. VVil-iam Alabaſter, how Parker and his ollegues were conſecrated Biſhops? nſwered, he hoped that in Caſe of ne-eſſity a Prieſt (alluding to Scory, might*

might ordein Bishops. This answe
his was objected in Print by Ho
wood, *againſt him and all the Eng*
Clergy in the yeare 1603, *not a word*
plied, Bancroft *himſelf being t*
living. And why might not *Holywo*
miſinformed of the Bishop of *London*,
well as you yourſelves were miſinfor
of the Bishop of *Durham*? This is cer
he could not allude to Bishop *Scory*, w
was conſecrated a Bishop in the reig
Edward the ſixth, as by the Records of th
times appeareth; uuleſſe you have a m
to accuſe all Records of Forgery. If y
have any thing to ſay againſt Bishop *Sc*
ryes Conſecration, or of any of them w
joined in Ordeining Arch Bishop *Parke*
ſpare it not, we wil not ſeek help of
Act of Patliament to make it good.

In ſumme, I doe not believe a word
what is ſaid of Bishop *Bancroft*, *ſub modo*
it is here ſet down, nor that this Accuſati
did ever come to the knowledge of th
prudent Prelate; if it did, he had grea
matters to trouble his head withall, th
Mr. *Holywords* bables: but if ever ſuch
a queſtion was propoſed to him, it may b
after a clear anſwer to the matter of Fa

might urge this as *argumentum ad homi-*
m; that though both Bishop *Scory* and Bi-
op *Coverdale* had been but simple Priests,
s they were complete Bishops, yet joi-
ng with Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop
odgkings, two undoubted Bishops
therwi*e* *Gardiner* and *Bonner* and *Tunstall*
d *Thurleby* and the rest were no Bi-
ops,) the Ordination was as Cano-
call, as for one Bishop and two Mi-
ed Abbats to consecrate a Bishop
which you allow in case of Necessity), or
ne Bishop and two simple Presbyters
consecrate a Bishop by Papall Dispen-
tion. So this question will not concern
s at all, but them very much, to reconcile
hemselves to themselves. They teach
hat the matter and form of Ordination are
ssentialls of Christs own Institution, They
each that it is grievous Sacrilege to change
he matter of this Sacrament, They teach
hat the matter of Episcopall Ordination
s Imposition of hands of three Bishops,
pon the person consecrated: and yet
with them one Bishop and two Abbats, or
ne Bishop and two simple Priests extraor-
linarily by Papall dispensation, may or-
dein Bishops. The essentialls of Sacra-
ments doe consist *in indivisibili*, once Essen-
tiall

tiall alwaies Eſſentiall, whether ordinari
or extraordinarily whether with diſpe
tion or without. So this Queſtion whet
a Prieſt in caſe of Neceſſity may ordein
shops, doth concern them much, but us
at all. But for my part I believe the wh
Relation is feined, for ſo much as conc
neth Bishop *Bancroft*.

They adde, or the one of them, *I ha
ſpoken vvith both Catholicks and Pr
teſtants, that remember neare 8
yeares, and acknovvledge that ſo l
they have heard the* Nagges he
ſtory related as an undoubted trut
Where I wonder? ſooner in *Rome* or *R
mes* or *Doway*, then in *England*, and ſoone
in a Corner then upon the Exchange. Y
have heard from good Authors of t
Swans ſinging, and the Pellicans pricki
of her Breaſt with her bill: but you are wi
then to believe ſuch groundleſſe Fictio
I produce you ſeven of the ancient Biſho
of England, ſome of them neare an 10
yeares old, who doe teſtify that it is
groundleſſe Fable: yet they have more re
ſon to know the right value of our Eccle
ſiaſticall Records, and the truth of ou
affair

faires, then any whom you converſe withall:

The Authours proceed, *This Narration of the Conſecration at the* Nagges head, *have I taken out of* Holywood, Conſtable, *and Doctor* Champnies *vvorkes.* They heard from many *of the ancient Clergy, vvho vvere Priſoners for the Catholick Religion in* Wyſbich *Caſtle*, as Mr. Blewet, Doctor Watſon, *Biſhop of* Lincoln, *and others. Theſe had it from the ſaid Mr.* Neale *and other Catholicks preſent at* Parkers *Conſecration in the* Nagges head, *as Mr.* Conſtable *affirmes* Here is nothing but hearſay, upon hearſay, ſuch Evidence would not paſſe at a tryall for a lock of Goats wooll. *Holywood* aud the reſt had it from ſome of the *Wiſbich* Priſoners: and the *Wiſbich* Priſoners heard it from Mr. *Neale* and others.

What others? had they no names? did Biſhop *Bonner* ſend more of his Chapleins then one to be Spectators of the Conſecration, and they who were to be conſe-

conſecrated permit them being Adverſa
ro continue among them, during the Co
ſecration, ſuppoſed to be a Clandeſti
Action. It is not credible, without a Pl
between *Neale* and the Hoſt of the *Na*
head, to put him and his fellowes for t
day into Drawers habits, leaſt the Biſho
ſhould diſcover them. Here is enou
ſaid to diſgrace this Narration for ev
that the firſt Authors that published it
the world, did it after the yeare 160
untill then it was kept cloſe in Lavande
Bishop *Watſon* lived ſplendidly with t
Bishops of *Ely* and *Rocheſter*, at the time
Arch-Bishop *Parkers* Conſecration, a
a long time after, before he was remove
to *Wisbich* Caſtle. If there had been an
ſuch thing really acted, and ſo notoriouſl
known, as they pretend, Bishop *Watſo*
and the other Priſoners, muſt needs hav
known it long before that time, when Mr
Neale is ſuppoſed to have brought them
the firſt newes of it. The whole ſtory is
compoſed of Inconſiſtences. That which
quite ſpoileth their ſtory, is that Arch Bi-
ſhop *Parker* was never preſent at any o
theſe Conſecrations, otherwiſe called
Confirmation Dinners: but it may be the
merry Hoſt shewed Mr. *Neale* Doctor

Bullingham

llingham for Arch *Bishop Parker*, and d him what was done in the withdraw- roome, which (to gaine more credit to Relation) he feigued that he had ſeen, t of pure zeale.

Howſoever, they ſay *the Story was divul- to the great griefe of the newly Conſecrated, being ſo evident a truth they durſt not contra- it.* We muſt ſuppoſe that theſe Fathers ve a Privilege to know other mēs hearts, t let that paſſe. Let them tell us how it s divulged by word or writing, when d where it was divulged whileſt they re newly conſecrated, who divulged it d to whom? If they can tell us none of this, it may paſſe for a great preſump- n, but it cannot paſſe for a proofe.

But they ſay, that *not onely the Nullity of Conſecration, but alſo the illegality of the me was objected in Print againſt them not long ter, by that famous writer Doctor* Stapleton *d others.* We looke upon Doctor *Sta- eton*, as one of the moſt Rationall heads at your Church hath had ſince the ſepe- tion: but ſpeake to the purpoſe Fathers, d Doctor *Stapleton* print one word of the *Jagges head* Conſecration. You may be re he would not have balked it, if there d been any ſuch thing, but he did balke it

it becauſe there was no ſuch thing. N
no, Doctr. *Stapletons* pretended illega
was upon another ground, becauſe he d
amed that King *Edwards* Statute was re
aled by Queen *Mary*, and not reſtored
Queen *Eliſabeth*, for which we have
expreſſe Act of Parliament againſt him
the point: and his ſuppoſed invalidity w
becauſe they were not conſecrated *ritu R*
mano. If you think Doctor *Stapleton* h
ſaid any thing that is materiall, to prove t
invalidity or nullity of our Conſecratio
take your bowes and arrowes and shoo
over his ſhafts againe, and try if you d
not meet with ſatisfactory anſwers, bot
for the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and the C
nons of the Catholick Church, and th
Lawes of *England*.

You ſay, *Parker and the reſt of the Pro*
teſtant Biſhops, not being able to anſwer the Ca
tholick arguments againſt the invalidity of thei
Ordination &c. Words are but wind. Th
Church of *England* wanted nor Orthodo
Sonnes enough to cope with *Stapleton* an
all the reſt of your Emiſſaries: nor *to cry*
down the illegall and extravagant manner of a
at the Nagges head. How should they cry
down, that which never had been cryed
up in thoſe daies? We condemne, tha
which

n of Ordination which you feign to
e bee uſed at the *Nagges head*, as *illegall,*
extravagant, and (which weigheth
re then both of them) invalid, as much
ourſelves.

ey were forced to begge an act of Parliament,
reby they might enjoy the Temporalties, not
hſtanding the known defects of their Conſe-
tion &c. O Ingenuity! whither art thou
ed out of the world? Say, where is this
tition to be found, in the Records of *Eu-*
ia? Did the Parliament ever make any
h eſtablishment of their Temporalties,
re then of their Spiritualties? Did the
rliament ever take any notice of any De-
ts of their Conſecration? Nay, did not
e Parliament declare their Conſecration
have been free from all defects? Nay,
th not the Parliament quite contrary,
and theſe Reports for *ſlanderous ſpeeches,* 8. *Eliſ.*
d juſtify their Conſecrations to have *been* *cap.* 1.
ely and orderly done, according to the Lawes
this Realm: and that *it is very evident and*
pparent, that no cauſe of ſcruple ambiguity or
ubt, can be juſtly objected againſt their Ele-
ions Confirmations or Conſecrations.

Yet they give a reaſon of what they ſay,
or albeit Edward *the ſixths rite of*
Ordination was reeſtablished by Act of

Parliament in the first yeare of Queen Eli-
beth: *yet it was notorious that the Ordina-*
at the Nagges head *was very different from*
and formed extempore *by* Scoryes *Purita-*
call Spirit &c. I take that which you gra-
out of *Sanders*, that King *Edwards* Fo-
of Ordination, was reesstablished by Act
Parliament 1. *Elisabethæ*; wherein you d-
unwittinghly condemne both Bishop *Bon-*
and *Stapletons* plea of illegality. The r-
which you say is partly true and partly fal-
It is very true that there is great differen-
between the English Form of Ordeining
and your *Nagges head* Ordination, as mu-
as is between the head of a living horse a-
the sign of the *Nagges head*, or betwe-
that which hath a reall entity and an ima-
ginary *Chimæra* (*Mr. Mason* was th-
Bellerephon that destroyed this monster): B-
that the Form of the *Nagges head* Ordina-
tion was framed *extempore* by *Scoryes Pu-*
tanicall Spirit, is most false; That *Posth-*
mus brat was the *Minerva* or Issue of Mr.
Neales brain, or some others who fathere-
this rapping lie upon him.

Then they repeat the words of a part o-
the Statute, and thence conclude, *By whic-*
Act appeares that not onely King Edward-

rite

, but any other used since the begin-
of the Queeens reign, upon her
mission was enacted for good, and
quently that of the Nagges head
ht passe. Cujus cõtrarium verum est.

Contrary to what these Fathers infer-
doth follow necessarily from these
ds which the Fathers cite. The words
e Act are these, [*By virtue of the Queens*
rs Patents or Commission]: Every one of
Letters Patents is extant in the Rolles,
one of them did ever authorise any
but that which was legally establis-
that is, the Form of *Edward* the sixth.
, the Queens Letters Patents or Com-
ion hath an *aut minus* in it, *or at the least*
or foure of you: but to justify the *Nag-*
ead Ordination, the *aut minus* must be
ed to *at the least* one or two of you. Se-
dly, the Queens Letters Patents have
ies this clause in them: *Iuxta Formam*
fectum Statutorum in ea parte editorum &
isorum; *According to the form and effect*
e Statutes in that case made and provided:
he Statutes allow no lesse number then
, or at the least three to ordein, At the
ges head (you say there was but one

Ordeiner. Our Statutes preſcribe *Im*
tion of Hands as the Eſſentiall matter of
dination, and theſe words, *Receive the*
Ghoſt as the form of Ordination: but
Nagges head Ordination is a mere P
taſm, without matter or Forme; our
tutes allow no ſuch fanaticall and Ph
ſticall Formes, as your Form of the *N*
head. And ſo your Conſequence, [*C*
quently that of the Nagges head might paſſe]
foundered of all four, and can neither
nor repaſſe, unleſſe you can raſe t
words [*by virtue of the Queens Letters Pa*
out of the Statute, and inſert theſe [*wi*
the Queens Letters Patents]: and like
raſe theſe words out of the Commi
[*according to the Form and effect of the Sta*
and inſert theſe [*contrary to the Form and*
fect of the Statutes]. A ſingle Falſificat
will doe your cauſe no good. T
poiſons may perchance help it at a d
lift.

It is in vain to tell us, that Mr *Maſon ſee*
over clear to be denied, who know better t
Mr. *Maſon* did not onely deny it over a
over again, but ſqeeſed the poore Fable
durt. I have ſhewed you particularly wh
was the end of the Queens Diſpenſation
th

e ſame which is the end of Papall Diſ-
enſations, to meet with latent objections
r cavills. I have shewed you what that
avill was; which needed no Diſpenſa-
on in point of Law, but onely to ſtop the
ouths of Gainſaiers. But where you adde,
at *the Queens Diſpenſation was given, not in*
ndition all but in very abſolute Termes: You
re abſolutely miſtaken. The Queens diſ-
enſation was both in Generall Termes,
hich determin nothing, (not like the Popes
Diſpenſations, *A quibuſvis excom-*
unicationis ſuſpenſionis & interdicti
ntentiis): and alſo in theſe condi-
ionall Terms, *ſi quid &c. deſit aut*
eerit eorum quæ per Statuta hujus reg-
i noſtri, aut per leges Eccleſiaſticas in
ac parte requiruntur: *If any thing is*
r ſhall be wanting, which are required
y the Lawes Civill or Eccleſiaſticall of
his Kingdome. You ſee it is conditionall
nd hath reference onely to the Lawes of
ngland.

hey goe on, *the truth is, all the world laughed*
t the Nagges head *Conſecration, and held it to*
e invalid, not ſo much for being performed in
Tavern, as for the new form invented by Scory.

If all the world did laugh at it in those da
they laughed in their ſleeves, where
body could ſee them laugh. It had be
too much to laugh at a jeaſt before it
made, nay before it was deviſed. T
Reader may well wonder, how *all the*
came to get notice of it ſo early as the
ginning of Queen *Elizabeths* reign,
we onely in *England* should heare noth
of it for above 40 yeares after? but afſo
as we did heare of it, we laught at it as
as they, and held it as invalid as t
could doe for their hearts; but t
laught at it as Bishop *Scoryes* Inventio
and we laught at it as theirs.

CAP. VII.

*Of Bishop Bonner, the Recordi
tion of our Clergy, the qualit
their witneſſes, Mr. Fitzhe
berts ſuſpicions, the teſtimony
their Doctors, and the Pub
shing of our Regiſter before M
Maſon*

Their next inſtance is in Bishop *Bonn*
caſe, who *was indited by Mr.* Horn,

the First Proteſtant Biſhops conſecrated by Mr. Parker, *or together with him, for refuſing to take the Oath of Supremacy.* The firſt errour might be pardoned, as being onely a miſtake in a word, to ſay that Biſhop *Bonner* was *indited* by Mr. *Horn*, where he was onely ſignified by Biſhop Horn: but the ſecond miſtake is fatall, that after all this confidence, and this great Notoriety of the *Nagges head* Ordination *to all the world*, theſe Fathers themſelves are ſtill uncertain, whether Biſhop Horn *were conſecrated by Archbiſhop* Parker, *or at the ſame time with him*; that is as much as to ſay, they know not certainly what was done at the *Nagges head*, but they wiſh that if the Confirmation dinner were not a Conſecration, it had been one. It could never end better, for Mr. *Neale* to feign an Ordination, without an Actuary to record what was done. Biſhop *Watſon* and Mr. *Bluet* and the reſt were much to blame, that ſince he had the fortune to weare *Gyges* his ring and walk inviſible) they did not cauſe him to play the publick Notary himſelf, and draw that which was done there into Acts; then we might have known as certainly as he could tell us, whether *Dr. Parker* had been conſecrated there by his

Proctor Dr *Bullingham*. It may be, some very credulous Reader, who like the old *Lamiæ*, could take out his eyes and put them in again when he pleased, would have given more credit to Mr *Neales* pleasant Fable, then to the publick Rolles and Registers of the Kingdome.

I have handled Bishop *Bonners* case before: and these Fathers themselves have unwittingly given sentence in it against him; That *King* Edwards *Forme of Ordination, was reestablished by Act of Parliamant in the first yeare of Queen* Elisabeth. But finall sentence there was never any given, untill the Parliament gave a finall sentence in it, That Bishop *Horn* and all the rest were legall Bishops. To admit a Plea to be tryed by a Iury, and the veredict of the Iury, are two very distinct things.

They tell us, *he was a man specially shot at*. Rather he was a man graciously preserved by the Queens mercy, from the rage of the Common people against him. If they had *shot at* him, they could have found waies enough to have tendered the Oath of Supremacy to him, without Bi-

shop

Bishop Horn. I profeſſe I am no great Patron of ſuch Oaths, men have more dominion over their actions then over their judgements: Yet there is leſſe to be ſaid for Bishop *Bonner*, then for other men. He who had ſo great a hand in framing the Oath, He who had taken it himſelf, both in King *Henryes* time, and King *Edwards* time, and made ſo many others to take it, He who had been ſo great a ſticker in *Rome* for the Kings Supremacy, who writ that Preface before Bishop *Gardiners* booke *de vera Obedientia*: if he had ſuffered by the Oath of Supremacy, he had but been ſcourged with a rod of his own making.

Their next reaſon to prove the Nullity of our Holy Orders, is taken from *the conſtant Practice of the Romane Catholicks, to Reordein Proteſtant Miniſters, not conditionally but abſolutely*, which they call *an evident Argument of our mere Laity.* A doughty Argument indeed, drawn from their own Autho-

Authority. Can any man doubt, th
that they which make no ſcruple of taki
away our lifes, will make conſcience
taking away our Orders? This is t
which we accuſe them of, and they d
fairly begge the Queſtion. If Reordin
tion be Sacrilege (as they ſay it is), we
ready to convince them of groſſe Sacrile
or iterating all the Eſſentialls of Ordin
tion, the ſame matter and the ſame For
that is for Epiſcopacy, the ſame Impo
tion of Hands by three Bishops, and t
ſame words *Receive the Holy Ghoſt* &c
Some were of the ſame mind with th
Fathers in Queen *Maries* time: but P
the 4. and Cardinall *Poole* were wiſer, w
confirmed all Ordinations in *Edward* t
ſixths time indifferently, ſo the Perſo
profeſſed but their Conformity to the R
man Religion. How doth this conf
with your pretended Nullity?

They ſay, *Our Records were produced*
Mr: Maſon *in the yeares* 1613, *fifty year*
after they ought to have been shewed. The
forget that they were published in Print i
Arch Bishop *Parkers* lifetime, that the
were juſtified by the Parliament 8. *Eliſa-*
bethæ, that all of them goe hand in hand
with our Civill Records,

H

He ſaith, *it cannot be teſtified by any lawfull witneſſes* (produced by us) *that they were not forged.* This is their Method, firſt to accuſe us of Forgery, and then to put us to prove a Negative; where learnt he this form of proceding? By all Lawes of God and man the Accuſer is to make good his Accuſation; yet we have given him witneſſes beyond exception. They ſay, *there can not be a more evident mark of Forgery, then the concealment of Regiſters, if they be uſefull and neceſſary to the perſons in whoſe Cuſtody they are.* The proofe lieth on the other hand. Tell us how they were concealed, which were published to the world in Print, by a whole Parliament, by private perſons, and were evermore left in a Publick Office, where all the world might view them from time to time, who had either occaſion or deſire to doe it? That our Adverſaries did *inſult and Triumph over us,* is but un empty flourish without truth or reality, as we shall ſee preſently.

They ſay, *it is not worth refuting which ſome modern Proteſtants ſay, ye have no witneſſes of the ſtory of the* Nagges head &c. *but Roman Catholicks, we value not their Teſtimony, becauſe they are known Adverſaries.* This anſwer they term *Ridiculous*, and paralell

it

it with the anſwer of an Officer in *Ireland*. You will not find this anſwer ſo ridiculous, upon more ſerious conſideration. Proteſtants know that ſome Exceptions in Law, do deſtroy all Credit, and ſome other Exceptions do onely diminish credit. An Adverſaries Teſtimony may be admitted in ſome caſes, but it is ſubject to exception and makes no full proofe, eſpecially in caſes favourable in the Law; as the caſe of perſons ſpoiled, (which is your Irish caſe), ſuch witneſſes may be admitted, *ante omnia ſpoliatus reſtitui debet*: but then they ought to make up in number what they want in weight.

But you miſtake wholy, our anſwer is not, that *you produce no witneſſes for the ſtory of the* Nagges head *but Roman Catholicks*: Our anſwer is that you produce no witneſſes at all, neither Roman Catholicks nor others. For firſt one witneſſe is no witneſſe in Law, Let him be beyond exception duely ſworn and examined, yet his Teſtimony makes but *ſemiplenam probationem*, half a proofe; eſpecially in Criminall cauſes ſuch as this is, it is nothing. *One witneſſe ſhall not riſe up againſt a man*

Deut. 19. 15.

man for any Iniquity or any ſinne, At the mouth of two witneſſes or at the mouth of three witneſſes ſhall the matter be eſtabliſhed. Which law is confirmed by our Saviour. They were never yet able to pretend any eye witneſſe by name, bnt Mr. *Neale*, or ſome body that had no name, becauſe he had no being in the nature of things: all the reſt had it from Mr. *Neales* ſingle Teſtimony, becauſe they cannot teſtify what was done, but what Mr. *Neale* ſaid. *Mat.* 18.16.

Secondly, Mr. *Neale* teſtifieth nothing, as a ſingle witneſſe ought to teſtify. He was never ſworn to ſpeake the truth, he never teſtified it before a publick Notary, he was never examined before a competent Iudge, he was never produced before the face of a Proteſtant. Is this the mannet of the Romans now a daies, to condemne whole Churches upon the verball Teſtimony of a ſingle witneſſe, before he be brought face to face with thoſe whom he accuſeth; and ſuch a Teſtimony which is clogged with ſo many improbabilities and incongruities, and incoherences, that no rationall impartiall man can truſt one ſyllable of it? whereas

whereas in ſuch a caſe as this, againſt the third Eſtate of the Kingdome, againſt the Records Civill and Eccleſiaſticall, againſt the teſtimony of a Parliament, an hnndred witneſſes ought not to be admitted.

We regard not Mr. *Fitzherberts ſuſpicions* at all. What are the ſuſpicions of a private ſtranger, to the well known credit of a publick Regiſter? His *ſuſpicions* can weigh no more then his reaſons, that is juſt nothing. He ſaith *this exception is no new quarrell, but vehemently urged to the English Clergy in the beginning of the Queens reign, to ſhew how and by whom they were made Prieſts Bishops &c:* You have ſaid enough to confute yourſelves, but you touch not us. If they had known that they were conſecrated at the *Nagges head*, as well as you would ſeem to know it, they needed not to urge it ſo vehemently to shew how and by whom they were ordeined; they would have done that for them readily enough: unleſſe perhaps you thinke that they concealed the *Nagges head* Ordination out of favour to the Proteſtants. But I ſee you are miſtaken in this as in all other things. There was an old objection indeed, that our Conſecraters were not Roman Catholiks, and that our Conſecration was not *Rim*

Ro.

mano, or that we were not Ordeined by pall Authority; but the *Nagges head* Or- nation is a new queſtion. What might whiſpered underhand, in the eares of edulous perſons of your own party in orners, we do not know: but for all your ntrary intimations, none of all your riters did dare to put any ſuch thing in int, for above fourty yeares after Arch ishop *Parkers* Conſecration. If *ſilent itneſſes in ſuch circumſtances prove more then ers*, as you affirm, then all your writers e our witneſſes. But none of all your octors did ever urge any ſuch thing, as equired that we ſhould cite the Regiſters prudence, as by a cleare anſwer to all our Teſtimonies ſhall appeare. The ater did not ſtop there in thoſe dayes: et even in Arch Bishop *Parkers* life time he Conſecration of our Bishops was pub- lished to the world in Print; either ſhew s as much for your *Nagges head* Ordina- ion, or hold your peace for ever. Bishop *Andrews* the learned Bishop of *Wincheſters bſurdities falſities and lies*, are eaſily talked of, men may talke of black Swans: but he who hath laid your greateſt Champions in the duſt, requires another manner of Diſco- verer then Mr. *Fitzherbert*.

But

wherein there is an Oath, that *the Bishop of Rome ought not to have any Iurisdiction or Authority in this Realm.* And that it is declared in the 37. Article of our Church, that *the Bishop of* Rome *hath no Iurisdiction in this Kingdome of England.* And in the Oath ordained by Queen *Elisabeth*, That *no Forreign Prelate hath or ought to have, any Iurisdiction or Authority Ecclesiasticall or Spirituall within this Realm.*

I answer this Objection three wayes. First as to the two Lawes of *Henry* the eighth, They are both repealed long since by Queen Mary, and never were restored by any succeeding Prince, If there were any thing blame worthy in them let it dye with them. I confesse I approve not the Construing of one Oath for another, nor the swearing before hand to Statutes made or to be made. But, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum.*

Secondly, I answer according to the equity af my second ground, that although it were supposed that our Ancestors had over reached themselves and the truth in some expressions: yet that concerns not us at all, so long as we keep our selves exactly to the Line and Level of Apostolicall Tradition.

Thirdly and principally I answer, That our Ancesters meant the very same thing that

that we doe. Our onely difference is in the uſe of the Words *Spirituall Authority or Iuriſdiction*, Which we underſtand properly of Iuriſdiction purely Spirituall, which extendeth no further then the Court of Conſcience. But by *Spirituall Authority or Iuriſdiction*, they did underſtand Eccleſiaſticall Iuriſdiction in the Exteriour Court, which in truth is partly Spirituall partly Politicall; The interiour habit which enableth an Eccleſiaſticall Iudge to Excommunicate, or Abſolve, or degrade, is meerly Spirituall, but the Exteriour Coaction is Originally Politicall. So our Anceſtors caſt out Externall Eccleſiaſticall Coactive Iuriſdiction, The ſame doe wee: They did not take away frō the Pope the power of the Keyes, or Iuriſdictiō purely Spirituall; No more doe wee.

To cleare the whole buſineſſe, We muſt know, that in Biſhops there is a threefold power; The firſt of Order, The ſecond of Interiour juriſdiction, The third of Exteriour juriſdictiō. The firſt is referred to the Conſecrating and Adminiſtring of the Sacraments, The ſecond to the Regiment of Chriſtians in the interiour Court of Conſcience, The third to the Regiment of Chriſtian people in the Exteriour Court of the Church. Concerning the two former, I know no Controverſy between thē

Church of Rome and us but one, Whether the Biſhop of *Rome* alone *doe derive his Iuriſdiction immediatly from Chriſt, and all other Biſhops do derive theirs mediatly by him?* Yet I confeſſe this Controverſy is but with a part of the Church of Rome: For many of them are of our mind, that *all Biſhops hold their Iuriſdiction immediatly from Chriſt, as well as the Pope.* And if it were otherwiſe, it were the groſſeſt abſurdity in the world. For thouſands of Biſhops in Chriſtendome, doe not at all derive their holy Orders from S. *Peter*, or any other Roman Biſhop, either mediatly, or immediatly (eſpecially in *Aſia* and *Africa*,) but frō the other Apoſtles. Muſt all theſe poore Biſhops wāt the Key of Iuriſdiction, and be but half Biſhops, to humour the Court of *Rome*? For they never had ordination, or Delegation, or Commiſſion from *Rome*, either mediatly or immediatly, yet the Chriſtiā World hath evermore received them for true complete Biſhops.

But we have a Controverſy with ſome others, who acknowledge no power of Governing in a Biſhop but meerly directive, neither more nor leſſe then a Phiſitian hath over his Patient, To adviſe him to abſtain from ſome meats becauſe they are hurtfull to him; which adviſe the Patient, may either obey or rejéct without ſinne. But all the

Schooles

Schooles have tyed two Keys to the Churches Girdle, the Key of Order and the Key of Iurisdiction, and I doe not mean to rob my Mother of one of her Keys. *What will ye, shall I come unto you with a Rod?* A rod is more then chiding. The principall Branch of this Rod is Excommunication (a Punishment more to be feared in the Iudgement of the Fathers then all earthly Paines. The Spirituall Sword, Like the cutting of a member in the Body naturall, Or the outlawing of a Subject in the body Politicall. It is a Question in the *Schooles*, whether the Pastors Sentence in binding and loosing, be onely Declarative, or also Operative? As if such glorious promises, and so great solemnity where with this power was given, did imply a naked declaration; Keys are not given to signify the doore is open or shut, but to open or shut it indeed. For my part I have alwayes esteemed this Question, to be a meer Logomachy or Contention about words. They who make the Sentence onely declarative in respect of man, doe acknowledge it to be operative in respect of God. And they who make it to be Operative, make it to be Operative by the power of God, not of man. Whether the effect be attributed to the principall cause, or to the Instrument, being rightly understood, it is both wayes true.

1. *Cor.* 4. 21.

But this will not excuſe our Innovators, who have robbed the Church of one of her Keys, the Key of Spirituall juriſdiction. They are ſo Icalous of the honour of God, that they deſtroy the beauty of the world, and jumpe over the backes of all ſecond cauſes; and ſo they would make the holy Sacraments to be bare Sigus. As it was ſaid of old, *the ſword of the Lord and of Gideon*: ſo we may ſay now, the Key of Chriſt and his Paſtor. *St. Paul* taxeth the Corinthians for ſaying *I am of Paul*, *I am of Apollo*, *I am of Cephas*, *I am of Chriſt*, *What* (ſaith he) *is Chriſt divided*? Is Chriſt divided from his Miniſters? As it is an Errour on the one hand to depend ſo much upon *Paul*, and *Apollo*, and *Cephas*, or any of them, as not to depend principally upon Chriſt: ſo it is an Errour on the other hand ſo depend ſo upō Chriſt, as to neglect *Paul Apollo* and *Cephas*.

1. *cor.* 1. 12.

In ſumme Chriſt made his Apoſtles not onely Lawiers to give Adviſe, but Iudges to give Sentence. He gave them not onely a Command but a Commiſſion, *As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*, That is, I do conſtitute you my Deputies, and Surrogates, with as ample power and commiſſion as my Father gave me; Bind, Looſe, Remitt, Retein, whatſoever you doe on earth (*Clave non errante, as long as your Key erre*

Ioh. 20. 21.

not) I confirm in heaven. This is the Difference between the binding and loosing of Christ, and the binding and loosing of his Ministers; His power is Originall, Primitive Soveraign, Imperiall; Their power is derivative, Subordinate, Delegate, Ministeriall. His Sentence is absolute *ad Sententiandum simpliciter*; Their Sentence is Conditionall *ad Sententiandum si*. His Key never erreth, Their Key may erre and many times doth erre. To conclude the Apostles had a legislative power, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater Burthen then these Necessary things*. The Observation of *Sunday*, was an Apostolicall precept, so is the Order of Deacons. They had a Iudiciary power, and their Tribunalls; *Against an Elder receive not an Accusation, but before two or three witnesses*. They had a dispensative power, *To whom I forgave any thing for your sakes, forgave I it in the person of Christ?* But all this is onely in the interiour Court of Conscience. *Act* 15 28. 1. *Tim.* 5. 19. 2. *Cor.* 2. 10.

The third power of Bishops, is the power of exteriour Iurisdictiō in the Court of the Church, whereby men are compelled against their wills by Exteriour Meanes. This the Apostles had not frō Christ, nor their Successours frō them, Neither did Christ ever assume any such power to him self in the world, *My Kingdome is not of this world*: And, *Man who made me a Iudge or diuider over you?* Yet the greatest Controversies *Ioh.* 18. 36. *Luke* 12. 14.

at this day in the Eccleſiaſticall Court are about Poſſeſſions, as Glebes, Tithes, Oblations, Portions, Legacies, Adminiſtrations, &c. And if it were not for theſe, the reſt would not be ſo much valued, *in Criminibus non in Poſſeſſionibus poteſtas veſtra, quoniam propter illa & non propter has accepiſtis Claves regni Cælorum*, Saith, St. Bernard well to the Pope. *Your power is in Crimes not in poſſeſſions, for thoſe and not for theſe you received the Keys of the kingdome of Heaven.* But ſuppoſe the Controverſy to be about a Crime, Yet who can ſummon another mans Subjects to appear where they pleaſe, and impriſon or punish them for not appearing without his leave? All that power which Eccleſiaſticall Judges have of Externall Coaction, they owe it wholy either to the Submiſſion of the parties, where the Magiſtrate is not Chriſtian (as the Iewes at this day doe undergoe ſuch Penitentiall Acts as are enjoined them by their Superiours; becauſe the Reverence of them who obey, doth ſupply the defects of their power who Command) Or where the Magiſtrate is Chriſtian, they owe it to his Gracious Conceſſions. Of which if any Man doubt, and deſire to ſee how this Coactive power, how theſe externall Privileges, did firſt come to be enjoyed by Eccleſiaſticall perſons,

Bern. de Conſid. lib. 1.

Let

Let him read over the firſt booke of the *Code*, and the *Authenticks* or *Novels* of *Iuſtinian*. And for our English Church in Particular, let him conſult with our beſt Hiſtoriographers. *Eadmerus* was one whom they need not ſuſpect of partiality, as being Pope Vrbanes own Creature, and by his ſpeciall appointment placed over Anſelm, at his own intreaty, as a Superviſer to exerciſe his Obedience. Whoſe injunctions had ſo much power over him, that *if he placed him in his Bed, he would not onely not riſe without his Command, but not ſo much as turn himſelf from one ſide to another. Vt cum Cubili locaſſet, non ſolum ſine præcepto ejus non ſurgere: ſed nec latus inverteret.* What Marvell is it if the ancient Liberties of the English Church went firſt to wrack in *Anſelms* Dayes, about the Yeare of our Lord 1000 (for he died *Anno* 1109) who being a Stranger Primate had ſo totally ſurrendered up his own reaſon to the Popes Creature? Yet this *Eadmerus* ſaith of *Lanfranke*, *His wiſdome recovered other Cuſtomes, which the Kings of* England *by their Munificence, had granted to the Church of* Canterbury *in ancient times, and eſtabliſhed them for ever by their ſacred Decrees, that it might be moſt free in all things.* All externall exemption and Coaction is Politicall, and proceedeth originally from the Soveraign Prince. This

Malms de Geſt. Pont. Angl. l. 1. pa. 120.

Eadmer l. 4. p. 120.

This is that which S. *Paul* teacheth us, *The weapons of our warfare are not Carnall.* The weapons of the Church are Spirituall, not worldly, not externall: But *Citations*, and *Compulsories*, and *Significavits*, and Writs *ad excommunicatum capiendum* (which are not written by the Bishops own hand, yet at his beck,) and *Apparitors*, and *Iaolers*, &c, Are Weapons of this world, and tend to externall Coaction. For all which, the Church is beholden to the Civill power, to whom alone externall Coaction doth properly and originally belong. This is that which St. *Chrysostome* observed in his comparison between a Bishop and a Shepheard, *It is not lawfull to cure men, with so great Authority as the Shepheard cureth his Sheep. For it is free* for the Shepheard, *to bind his sheep, to drive them from their meat, to burn them, to cut them*: But in the case of the Bishop, *the Faculty of curing consisteth not in him who administreth the Phisick, but in him that is sick*, &c. St. *Chrysost.* speaketh of power purely Spirituall, which extendeth it self no further thē the Court of conscięce, where no man can be cured against his will: But Soveraign Princes have found it expediēt, for the good both of the Church and of the Commonwealth, to strengthen the Bishops hāds, by imparting some of their Politicall authority to him; from whose gracious

Chrysostom. lib. 2. de Sacerdotio.

cious indulgence, all that externall coactive power which Bishops have, doth proceed.

Now to apply this to our purpose. Whereſoever our Lawes doe deny all Spirituall Iuriſdiction to the Pope in *England*, it is in that ſenſe that wee call the exteriour Court of the Church, the *Spirituall Court*; They doe not intend at all to deprive him of the power of the Keys, or of any Spirituall power that was bequeathed unto him by Chriſt or by his Apoſtles, when he is able to prove his Legacy. Yea even in relation to *England* it ſelf, Our Parliaments never did pretend to any power to change or Abridge divine right. Thus much our very Proviſo in the body of our Law doth teſtify, that it was no part of our meaning, to vary from the Articles of the Catholick Faith in any thing, *Nor to vary from the Church of Chriſt in any other thing, declared by the holy Scripture and the word of God, neceſſary to ſalvation.* If wee have taken away any thing that is of divine right, it was retracted before it was done. Then followeth the true Scope of our Reformation, *Onely to make an Ordinance by Pollicies neceſſary and convenient, to repreſſe Vice and for good Conſervation of the Realm in peace, unity, and tranquillity, from ravine and ſpoile, inſuing much the ancient Cuſtomes of this Realm in that behalf.*

25. *Hen.* 8. *An Act for Exoneration.*

That

That wich profeſſed it ſelf a *Politick Ordinance* doth not meddle with Spirituall Juriſdiction. If it had medled with Spirituall Iuriſdiction at all, it had not *inſued the ancient* Cuſtomes *of the Realm of* England.

In ſumme that externall Papall power which we rejected and caſt out, and which onely we caſt out, is the ſame which the English Biſhops adviſed *Anſelm* to renounce, when it was attempted to be obtruded upon the Kingdome, *But know, that all the Kingdome complaineth againſt thee, that thou endeavoureſt to take away from our* Common *Maiſter the Flowers of his Imperiall Crown, Whoſoever takes away the Cuſtomes which pertein to his royall dignity, doth take away his Crown and Government together: for we prove that one cannot be decently had without the other. But we beſeech the conſider, and caſt away thy Obedience to that* Vrban, *who cannot help the if the King be offended, nor hurt thee if the King be pacified. Shake of the yoke of Subjection, and freely, as it becomes an Arch-biſhop of* Canterbury, *in all thy Actions expect the Kings pleaſure and Commands.* What ſoever power our Lawes did diveſt the Pope of, they inveſted the King with it: but they never inveſted the King with any Spirituall power or Iuriſdiction, witneſſe the Injunctions of Queen *Eliſabeth*, witneſſe

Eadmer l. 1. pag. 8.

1. *Eliz.* 1.

witneſſe the publick Articles of our Church, witneſſe the Profeſſions of King *Iames*, witneſſe all our Statutes themſelves, wherein all the parts of Papall power are enumerated which are taken away; His *Encroachments*, his *Vſurpations*, his *Oaths*, his *Collations*, *Proviſions*, *Penſions*, *Tenths*, *Firſt fruits*, *Reſervations*, *Palls*, *Vnions*, *Commendams*, *Exemptions*, *Diſpenſations* of all kinds, *Confirmations*, *Licenſes*, *Faculties*, *Suſpenſions*, *Appeales*, and God knoweth how many pecuniary Artifices more: but of them all, there is not one that concerneth Iuriſdiction purely Spirituall, or which is an eſſentiall right of the power of the Keys; They are all Branches of the Externall Regiment of the Church, the greater part of them uſurped from the Crowne, ſundry of them from Bishops, and ſome found out by the Popes themſelves, as the payment for Palls, which was nothing in *S. Gregories* time, but a free gift or liberality or bounty, free from impoſition and exaction.

Laſtly conſider the grounds of all our grievances, expreſſed frequently in our Lawes, and in other writers, *The diſinheriting of the Prince and Peers*, *The deſtruction and Anullation of the Lawes and the Prerogative Royall*, *The Vexation of the King Liege people*, *The*

The impoverishing of the Subjects, the draining the Kingdome of its treasure, The decay of Hospitality, The disservice of God, And filling the Churches of England with Forreiners, The excluding Temporall Kings and Princes out of their Dominions, The subjecting of the Realm to spoil and ravine, grosse Simoniacall contracts, Sacrilege, Grievous and intolerable oppressiõs and extortions, Iurisdiction purely Spirituall doth neither disinherit the Prince nor the Peers, nor destroy and anull the Lawes and Prerogative royall, nor vex the Kings Liege people, nor impoverish the Subject, nor draine the Kingdome of its Treasures, nor fill the Churches with Forreiners, nor exclude Temporall Kings out of their Dominions, nor subject the Realm to spoile and Ravine. Authority purely spirituall is not guilty of the decay of Hospitality, or disservice of Almighty God, or Simony, or Sacrilege, or oppressions and extortions. No, No, it is the externall regiment of the Church, by new Roman Lawes and Mandates, by new Roman Sentences and Iudgements, by new Roman Pardons and dispensations, by new Roman Synods and Oaths of Fidelity, by new Roman Bishops and Clerkes; It is your new Roman Tenths, and First fruits, and Provisions, and Reservations, and Pardons, and Indulgences, and the rest of those *horrible mischiefs and damnable Customs,*

ſtoms, that are apparently guilty of all theſe evills. Theſe Papall Innovations we have taken away indeed, and deſervedly, having shewed the expreſſe time and place and perſon, when and where and by whom, every one of them was firſt introduced into England. And we have reſtored to every Bird his own Feather, To the King his Politicall Supremacy, to the Peers their Patronages, to the Bishops that Iurisdiction which was due to them, either by Divine right or Humane right. More then theſe Innovations we have taken nothing away, that I know of. Or rather it is not wee, nor *Henry* the eighth, who did take theſe Innovations away: but our Anceſters by their Lawes, three, foure, five hundred yeares old; ſo ſoone as they began to ſprout out, or indeed before they were well formed, as their Statutes yet extant doe evidence to the world? But that filth which they ſwept out at the Fore doore, the Romã Emiſſaryes brought in again at the back doore. All our part or share of this worke, was to confirm what our anceſters had done.

I ſee no reaſon why I might not conclude my diſcourſe upon this Subject, *Mutatis Mutandis*, with as much Confidence as Sanders

Sanders did his visible Monarchy, *Quisquis jurabit per Viventem in æternum &c. Whosoever shall sweare by him that liveth for ever*, that the Church of *England* is not Schismaticall, in respect of any Branches of Papall power, which shee hath cast out at the Reformation, he shall not forswear himself. But Wagers and Oaths and Protestations, are commonly the Arguments of such as have got the wrong end of the staffe. I will shut up this long Discourse concerning *Henry* the eighths Reformation, with a short *Apostrophe* to my Countrymen of the Roman Communion in England.

They have been taught, that it is we who Apostate from the Faith of our Ancestors in this point of the Papacy, that it is we who renounce the Vniversall and perpetual Tradition of the Christian world. Whereas it is we who maintain ancient Apostolicall Tradition against their upstart Innovations: whereas it is we who doe propugne the Cause of our Ancesters against the Court of Rome. If our Ancestors were Catholick in this Cause, we cannot be Schismaticall. Let them take heed least whilst they fly out of a Panicall Feare from a supposed Schisme, they doe not plunge themselves over head and eares into reall Schisme. Let thē choose, whether they will

joine

oine with their Anceſters in this cauſe, or with the Court of *Rome*, for with both they cannot joine. If true English blood run in their veins, they cannot be long deliberating about that which their Anceſters, even all the Orders of the Kingdome, voted unanimously, *That they would ſtand by their King, and maintaine the rights of his Imperiall Crown, againſt the Vſurpations of the Roman Court.* 15. Ri. 2. c. 4

I have repreſented clearly to you the true Controverſy, betweē the Church and Kingdome of *England* and the Court of Rome, concerning Papall power, not as it is ſtated by private writers, but in our English Lawes, a glaſſe that cannot deceive us, for ſo farre as to let us ſee the right Difference. Let them quit theſe groſſe Vſurpations; Why ſhould they be more aſhamed to reſtore our iuſt rights, then they were to plunder us of them? Let them diſtinguish between Iurisdiction purely Spirituall, and Iuriſdiction in the exteriour Court, which for the much greateſt part of it is Politicall: between the power of the Sword, which belongeth to the Civill Soveraign, and not to the Church further then he hath been graciouſly pleaſed to communicate it: between that Obedience wich procedeth from feare of wrath, or from feare of *Gods Revenger to*

execute

execute wrath (that is, the Soveraign Prince) and that Obedience which proceedeth
Ro. 13. meerly from *conſcience*; And then there is hope we may come to underſtand one another better.

It is true, there are other Differences between us: but this is the main Difference, which giveth Denomination to the Parties, And when they come to preſſe thoſe Differences, they may come to have ſuch another account as they have now. The wider the hole groweth in the middle of the Milſtone, Men ſee clearer through it. *Dies Diei eructat verbum & nox nocti indicat. Scientiam.* The latter day is the Schollar of the former.

Sect. I. Cap. X.

An anſwer to Mr. Serjeãt concerning immediate traditiõ and his two rules of Vnity.

BY this time wee ſee that *Mr. Serjeants* great *Diſpatch* will prove but a ſleeveleſſe Errand, and that his *Firſt Mover-ſhip in the Church*, which he thought ſhould have born down all before it, is an unſignificant expreſſion, and altogether impertinent to the true Controverſy between them and us. Vnleſſe as *Dido* did encompaſſe the whole Circuit of *Cathage*, with a Bulls hide by her art: ſo he within his *Firſt*

Mo-

Moorship can comprehend the Patronage of the English Church, and the right to Convocate and diſſolve and confirm English Synods, and to invalidate old Oaths and to impoſe new Oaths of Allegiance, and to receive Tenths and firſt fruits, and all Legiſlative Judiciary and diſpenſative power, Coactively in the exteriour Court of the Church, over English Subjects. He cannot plead any Charter from England, we never made any ſuch Grant: and althongh we had, yet conſidering how infinitely prejudiciall it is to the Publick Tranquility of the Kingdome, we might and ought more adviſedly to retract what we unadviſedly once reſolved. And for Preſcription, he is ſo far to ſeek, that there is a cleare Preſcription of eleven hundred Yeares againſt him. So there is nothing remaineth for him to ſtick to, but his empty pretenſe of divine Right, which is more ridiculous then all the reſt; to claime a divine right of ſuch a Soveraign power, which doth branch it ſelf into ſo many particulars, after eleven hundred Yeares, which for ſo many Ages had never been acknowledged, never practiſed in the English Church either in whole or in part.

We cannot believe that the whole Christian world were Mole-eyed, or did ſit in darkneſſe for ſo many Centuries of yeares; untill Pope *Hildebrand*, and Pope *Paſchalis*, did ſtart up like two new Lights with their Weapons in their hands, to thumpe Princes and knock them into a right Catholick beliefe.

And indeed this Anſwer to his pretended demonſtration, by a reall demonſtration where the true Controverſie doth lye, and who are the true innovators, doth virtually anſwer whatſoever he hath ſaid. So I might juſtly ſtop here and ſuſpend my former paines, but that I have a great mind to try if I can find out one of thoſe many Falſifications, and Contradictions, which he would make us believe he hath eſpied in my diſcourſe, if it be not the deception of his ſight.

Our faith not onely probable.

Firſt, he telleth us that *our beſt Champions doe grant, that our fauh and its grounds are but probable.* Surely he did write this between ſleeping and waking, when he could not well diſtinguish between neceſſary points of faith, and indifferent Opinions concerning points of faith: Or to uſe *Cajetans* expreſſion, between *determinare de fideformaliter*, and *determinare de eo quod eſt fidei Materialiter*,

teriùliter, Between points of faith neceſſary to be believed, And ſuch Queſtions as doe ſometimes happen in things to be believed. As for Eſſentialls of faith, the Pillars of the Earth are not founded more firmly, then our beliefe upon that undoubted Rule of *Vincentius*, *Quicquid ubique ſemper & ab omnibus*, &c. Whatſoever we believe as an Article of our faith, we have for it the Teſtimony and Approbation of the whole Chriſtian World of all Ages, and therein the Church of *Rome* it ſelf. But they have no ſuch perpetuall or Vniverſall Tradition, for their twelve new Articles of Pope *Pius*. This Objection would have become me much better then him. Whatſoever we believe, they believe, and all the Chriſtian World of all Places, and all Ages, doth now believe, and ever did believe; except condemned Hereticks: But they endeavour to obtrude new Eſſentialls of faith upon the Chriſtian World, which have no ſuch Perpetuall, no ſuch Vniverſall Tradition. He that accuſeth another, ſhould have an eye to himſelf.

Does not all the World ſee, that the Church of England ſtands now otherwiſe in order to the Church of Rome, then it did in Henry the ſevenths dayes? He addeth further, that *it is confeſſed*

pen or of the memory, after they have bee publickly amended, is like flies to delig in sores, and neglect the body when it sound. I have the same errour crept in a booke of mine, of [five] for [four], how it came I know not, for the booke w printed in my absence: but I have correct it in mine own Copy and in many Copie of my Friends, where I meet with th booke.

Lastly, there is no danger in such pet differences, so long as all parties doe sub mit themselves to the publick Registers o the Church, as all these writers doe; al though is may be some of them were bette acquainted with Polemick Writers, then with Registers, or the practicall customes of the Church of *England*. The very Reference or submission of themselves to the Register is an Implicit retractation of their errours. As in a City the Clocks may differ, and the peoples Iudgements of the time of the day, but both Clocks and Clerkes must submit to the Sun dyall when the sun shineth out: so all private memorialls must be, and are submitted to the publick Register of the Church. Where these Fathers talk of plurality of Registers, they erre because they understand not our Customes. Every Bi-

shop

hop throughout the Kingdome hath one egiſtry at leaſt, every Dean and Chapter ath a Regiſtry. The ordinations of Prieſts nd Deacons, and the Inſtitution of Clerkes o Benefices, are recorded in the Regiſtries f the Reſpective Bishops, in whoſe dio-eſſes they are ordeined and inſtituted. The lections of Bishops and Inthroniſations nd Inſtallations, in the Regiſtry of the eſpective Deans and Chapiters: and the Confirmations and Conſecrations of Bi-ops, in the Regiſtry of the Archbishop where they are conſecrated; except the Archbishop be pleaſed to grant a Commiſ-ion to ſome other Bishops, to Conſecrate he elected and confirmed Bishop in ſome ther place. But the ſame thing can not be ecorded originally but in one Regi-try.

CAP. VIII.

Dr. VVhitaker and Dr. Fulke defended, Bishop Barlowes Consecration justified, of Iohn Stowes Testimony, and the Earle of Notinghams &c.

HEre the Fathers take upon them the office of Iudges or Censors rather then of Advocates. *Mr. Mason ought to have answered as Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Fulke,* (they were both eminent *Drs.* in the Schooles) *who had reason to be better informed of the Records then he.* How? Nay nor half so well. They were both contemplative men, Cloistered up in *St. Iohns* College, better acquainted with Polemick writers, then with Records, They were both ordeined Deacons and Priests legally, Canonically, according to the Form prescribed by the Church of England: and were no such ill Birds to defile their own nests. If the Records of their Ordination will satisfy you that they were no Enthusiasts, (as you imagin,) you may quickly receive satisfaction: But if they had said any thing contrary to our Lawes and Canons, you must

ot thinke to wrangle the Church of En land out of a good poſſeſſion, by private oluntary ſpeculations. Let us ſee what heſe Doctrs ſay as you allege them, for I ave not their bookes in preſent. Mr. *Whitaker* ſaith, *I would not have you thinke we make ſuch reckoning of your Orders, as to hold our own Vocation unlawfull without them.* You ee Doctor *Whitaker* juſtifieth our Ordination in this very place as lawfull, and much more plainly elſwhere in his writings. That *hough our Biſhops and Miniſters be not Or-deined by Papiſticall Biſhops, yet they are or-derly and lawfully ordeined*: Again, *The Ro-maniſts account none lawfull Paſtors, but ſuch s are created according to their Form or Order.* Theſe are your two main Objections a-gainſt our Ordination, that we are not or-deined by Biſhops of your Communion. That we are not ordeined according to the Roman Form. In both of theſe Doctor *Whitaker* is wholy for us againſt you, that which he maketh no reckoning of, is your Form of Ordination, as it is contradiſtinct from ours, as it is in many things, eſpeci-ally in your double matter and Form in Prieſtly Ordination.

You ſay Mr. *Fulke* ſpeakes more plainly Let us heare him. *You are highly deceived*

if you thinke we esteem your Offices of Bishops, Priests and Deacons better then Laymen: and with all our heart we defie, abhorre, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasy, Antichristian Orders. This is high enough indeed, and might have been expressed in more moderate termes: but it is to be expounded, not of the invalidity of your Ordination, as if it wanted any Essentiall, but partly in respect of the not using or abusing these sacred Offices, and partly in respect of the Lawes of *England*. Excesses may make an Ordination unlawfull, although they do not make it invalid. Holy Orders are an excellent Grace conferred by God for the Conversion of men: but if those who have them, instead of preaching truth do teach errours to his people, and adulterate the old Christian Faith by addition of new Articles, they are no longer true Pastors, but Wolves which destroy the Flock, and so they are not onely no better, but worse then Lay men, *Corruptio optimi pessima.* In this respect they tell you, that your Priests and Bishops are no true Priests and Bishops, as *Marcellus* told his Soldiers that they were no true Romans (who were naturall Romans) because they wanted the old Roman virtue. Lastly you have

habituall power to exerciſe theſe Offices, but you want actuall power in *England*, by reaſon of the not application, or rather the ſubſtraction of the matter by our Lawes: ſo you are no legall Biſhops or Prieſts there. This I take to have been the ſenſe of theſe two Doctors.

Now are we come to their grand exception, againſt Biſhop *Barlow*, who was one of the Conſecraters of Archbiſhop *Parker*, whoſe Conſecration is not found in the Archbiſhops Regiſter, and therefore they conclude that he was never conſecrated. If this objection were true, yet it doth not render Archbiſhop *Parkers* Conſecration either invalid or uncanonicall, becauſe there were three other Biſhops who joined in that Conſecration beſides Biſhop *Barlow*, which is the full number required by the Canons. But this objection is moſt falſe. Biſhop *Barlow* was a Conſecrated Biſhop above 20 yeares before the Conſecratiõ of Archbiſhop *Parker*. They ſhould have done well to have propoſed this doubt in Biſhop Barlows lifetime, and then they might have had the Teſtimony of his Conſecraters under an Archiepiſcopall or

Epiſco-

Episcopall Seale, for their satisfaction. The Testimony of the Archi-Episcopall Registler, is a full proofe of Consecration affirmatively, but it is not a full proofe negatively; such a Bishops Consecration is not recorded in this Registler, therefore he was not Consecrated. For first, the negligence of an Officer or some crosse accident might hinder the recording. Secondly Fire or Thieves or some such Casualty might destroy or purloin the Record. Thirdly though it be not recorded in this Registler, it may be recorded in another, the Arch Bishop may, and Arch Bishop *Cranmer* usually did delegate or give Commission to three other Bishops for Consecration. And though the work be ordinarily performed at *Lambeth*, because of the place, where they may have three Bishops alwaies present without any further Charge: yet they are not obliged by any Law to Consecrate them there. And if there be a sufficient number of Bishops near the Cathedrall which is to be filled, or if the person who is to be Consecrated do desire it, they may be Consecrated either in that, or any of their own Churches. The Bishops of the Province of Yorke, by reason of the former convenience

ience are usually consecrated at *Lambeth*, et I have known in my time Bishop *Sine-es* of *Carlile* consecrated at Yorke upon is own desire, by the Archbisop of *Yorke*, nd the Bishops of *Durham*, *Chester*. and *Ma* A man might seek long enough for his Consecration in the Archbishop of *Canter-uries Register* and misse it, but it is to be found in the Register at Yorke. So the Omission of it in that Register though it be no full proote, yet it is a probable proofe that Bishop *Barlow* was not Consecrated here, but it is no proofe at all that he was not Consecrated elswere.

And this I take to have been the case both of Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop Gardiner: and although the effluxion of above an hundred yeares since, hath rendered it more difficult to find where it was done, yet by the help of those Records which are in the Court of Faculties, I should not despaire of finding it yet.

But there are so many evident proofes that he was Consecrated, that no ingenuous person can have the Face to deny it. The first reason is, his actuall possession of 4. Bishopricks one after another, St. *Assaph*, St. *Davids*, *Bath and Wells* and *Chicheſter*, in the Reigns of three Princes. They feign some pretenses why Archbishop *Parker* was

not consecrated Canonically, because there wanted a competent number of Bishops, though it were most false: but what can they feign why Bishop *Barlow* was not consecrated in *Henry* the eighths time? was *Henry* the eighth a Baby to be jeasted withall? In Archbishop *Parkers* case, they suppose all the Bishops to have been stark mad, to cast themselves down headlong from a Precipice, when they had a faire paire of Stairs to descend by: but in Bishop *Barlowes* case they suppose all the world to have been asleep; except there had been such an Vniversall sleep it had been impossible for any man in those dayes to creep into a Bishoprick in *England* without Consecration. To say he is actually possessed of a Bishoprick therefore he is Consecrated, is as clear a Demonstration in the English Law, as it is in nature to say the Sun shineth, therefore it is Day.

But it may be objected, that he held all these Bishopricks as a Commendatory, not in Title, as an Vsufructuary not as a true owner. It is impossible, Vsufructuaries are not elected and confirmed, but Bishop *Barlow* was both elected and Confirmed. The *Conge d'eslire* to the Dean and Chapter, the Letters Patents for his Confirmation, the Commission for the restitution of his Temporalties, do all prove that he was no Vsu-

Vsufructuary but a right owner, This is a ſecond reaſon.

Thirdly, The ſame Letters Patents that doe authoriſe Bishop *Barlowes* Confirmation, did likewiſe Command the Archbishop with the aſſiſtence of other Bishops to Conſecrate him himſelf, or to give a Commiſſiō to other Bishops to Conſecrate him, which if they did not perform within a preſcribed time, or perform after another manner thē is preſcribed by the Law, it was not onely a loſſe of their Bishopricks by the Law of *England*, but a Premunire or the loſſe of all their Eſtates, their Liberties, and a caſting themſelves out of the Kings Protectiō 25, Hen: 8. c. 20. No mē in their right wits would rnn ſuch a hazard, or rather evidētly ruine thēſelves and all their hopes without any need, without any ēd in the whole world. Fourthly, by the ſame Law no man could be acknowledged a Bishop in *England*, but he who was Conſecrated legally, by three Bishops with the conſent of the Metropolitan, but Biſhop *Barlow* was acknowledged to be a true Bishop; The King received his Homage for his Bishoprick; the *K*ing commāded him to be reſtored to his Temporalties, which is never done untill the Conſecratiō be paſſed. King *Henry* ſent him into *Scotland* as his Ambaſſadour with the title of Bishop of

of *St. Davids*; and in his restitution to the Temporalties of that See, the King relates that *the Arch Bishop had made him Bishop and Pastor of the Church of St.* Davids. This could not be if he had not been Consecrated.

Thirdly, he was admitted to sit in Parliament as a Consecrated Bishop: for no man can sit there as a Bishop before he be Consecrated, but it is plain by the Records of the house of the Lords that he did sit in Parliament many times in the 31 of *Henry* the 8. in his Episcopall habit, as a Consecrated Bishop; and being neither a Bishop of one of the five Principall Sees, nor a Privy Counseller, he must sit and did sit according to the time of his Consecration, between the *Bishops of Chichester* and St. *Assaph*. What a strange boldnesse, is it to question his Consecration now, whom the whole Parliament, and his Consecraters among the rest, did admit without scruple then as a Cõsecrated Bishop.

Sixthly, There is no act more proper or essentiall to a Bishop then Ordination, *What doth a Bishop that a Priest doth not* (saith St. Hierom) *except Ordination?* But it is evident by the Records of his own See, that Bishop *Barlow* did Ordein Priests and

acons

eacons frō time to time, and by the Arch
ishops Regiſter that he, joined in Epiſco-
ll Ordination, and was one of thoſe three
ishops who impoſed hands upon Bishop
uckley Feb. 19. 1541.

Seventhly, there is nothing that trieth a
ishops Title to his Chuch more then the
alidity and Invalidity of his Leaſes. If
ishop Barlow had been unconſecrated, all
he Leaſes which he made in the See of St.
Davids, and Bath and Wells, had been voide,
nd it had been the eaſieſt thing in the
hole world for his Succeſſour in thoſe
ayes, to prove whether he was conſecra-
ed or not, but they never queſtioned his
Leaſes, becauſe they could not queſtion his
Conſecration.

Laſtly, an unconſecrated perſon hath
neither Anteceſſors nor Succeſſors, he
ſucceedeth no man, no man ſucceedeth
him. If a grant of any hereditaments
be made to him and his Succeſſours,
it is abſolutely void, not worth a deaf
Nut; If he alien any Lands belon-
ging to his See from him and his Suc-
ceſſours, it is abſolutely void: But Bishop
Barlow received the Priory of *Brecknock*
from the Crown, to him and his Suc-
ceſſors Bishops of St. *Davids*, and in
King *Edwards* reign being Bishop of Bath
and

and *Wells*, he alienated from him and his Succeſſours to the Crown much Land, and received back again from the Crown to him and his Succeſſours equivalent Lands. If he had been unconſecrated all theſe Acts had been utterly void. In ſumme, whoſoever dreameth now that all the world were in a dead ſleep then for twenty yeares together, whileſt all theſe things were acting, is much more aſleep himſelf.

To theſe undeniable proofes I might adde as many more out of the Records of the Chancery, if there needed any to prove him a Conſecrated Bishop. As.

A grant to the ſaid *William Barlow* Bishop of St. *Davids*, to hold in Commendam with the ſaid Bishoprick the Rectory of *Carewe* in the county of *Pembrooke*. Dated Octob. the 29. Anno 38. Hen. 8.

A commiſſion for Tranſlation of *William Barlow* Bishop of St. *Davids* to the Bishoprick of *Bath* and *Wells*, Dated. 3. Feb. 2. Edv. 6.

A Commiſſion for the Conſecration of *Robert Farrer* to be Bishop of *St. Davids*, *per tranſlationem Willelmi Barlow &c.* Dated 3. Iul. Anno 2. Edv. 6.

A

A Commiſſion for the Reſtitution of the Temporalties of the ſaid Bishoprick to the ſaid *Robert Farrer*, as being void *per tranſlationem Willelmi Barlow*. Dated 1. Auguſti Anno 2. Edv. 6. In all which Records and many more he is alwaies named as a true Conſecrated Bishop.

And laſtly, in Bishop *Goodwins* booke *de Præſulibus Angliæ* pa. 663. of the Latin Edition printed at *London* Anno 1616. in his Catalogue of the Bishops of *St. Aſſaph* num. 37. he hath theſe words. *Gulielmus Barlow Canonicorum Regularium apud Bisham Prior Conſecratus eſt. Feb.* 22. *Anno* 1535; *Aprili deinde ſequente Meneviam tranſlatus eſt. VVilliam Barlow Prior of the Canons Regulars at Bisham was conſecrated the two and twentieth Day of February, in the yeare* 1535, *and in Aprill Followving vvas tranſlated to St. Davids.* Which confirmeth me in my former conjecture, that he was Conſecrated in *Wales*, which Bishop Goodwin by reaſon of his Vicinity, had much more reaſon to know exactly then we have.

They

They say Mr. Mason *acknowledgeth that* Mr Barlow *was the man who consecrated Parker, because* Hodgskins *the Suffragan of Bedford was onely an Assistent in that action: and the Assistents in the Protestant Church do not consecrate.* By the Fathers leave, this is altogether untrue. Neither was Bishop *Barlow* the onely man who Consecrated Archbishop *Parker*; Neither was Bishop Hodgskins a meere Assistent in that action; Thirdly, who soever doe impose hands are joint consecraters, with us as well as them; Lastly, *Mr. Mason* saith no such thing as they affirm, but directly the Contrary, that all the foure Bishops were equally Consecraters, all imposed hands, all joined in the words, and this he proveth out of the Register it self, L. 3. c. 9. n. 8. & l: 3. c. 10. n. 9.

They object *He might as well be proved to have been a lawfull Husband, because he had a woman, and diverse Children, as to have been a Consecrated Bishop because he ordeined. and Discharged all acts belonging to the Order of a Bishop.* What was Bishop *Barlowes*

Woman

oman pertinent to his cauſe. Are not overnants, and Devoteſſes, beſides ordiry maidſervants, women?

All which Paſtours not onely of their n Communion, but of their own Soci-, are permitted to have in their houſes. t themſelves be Iudges whether a Woan a wife, or a Woman a Governant or Devoteſſe, be more properly to be ranged der the name or notion of συνεισακτῶν, ch women as were prohibited to Coha- with Clerkes by the Councell of *Nice*. nt to leave the *Hypotheſis* and come to the *beſis*, as being more pertinent to the preent caſe. If a man have cohabited long ith a Woman as man and wife in the Geerall eſtimation of the world, and begot ildren upon her, and dies as her huſband ithout any doubt or diſpute during his fe and long after, though all the Witneſes of their Marriage were dead, and the egiſter loſt, this their Conjugall coabitation and the common reputation f the world during his Life uncontroverd, is in Law a ſufficient proofe of the arriage: but all the world *nemine contraicente* eſteemed Bishop *Barlow* as the undoubted Bishop and Spouſe of his Church,

They adde, *Ridley Hooper Farrer* [were] *acknowledged and obeyed as Bishops in* [King] Edwards *time, yet were Iudged by both* [the] *Spirituall and Temporall Court not to have* [been] *consecrated.* They mistake, they were not judged not to have been consecrated, (for their Consecrations are upon Record,) but not to have been consecrated *ritu Romano* after the Roman Form. And who gave this Iudgement? Their open enemies who made no scruple to take away their Lifes, whose unjust judgement we doe not value a rush: but *Paul* the 4. and Cardinal *Pole*; more authentick Iudges of their own party, gave a later Iudgemēt to the Cōtrary.

They aske, *how it is possible that Barlowes Cōsecration should not be found recorded (if ever it was), as well as his preferment to the Priory of* Bisham, *and Election and Confirmation to the Bishoprick of* St. Assaph. I answer it is very easy to conceive. I have shewed him sundry wayes how it might be, and one probable way how it was. I desire the Reader to observe the extreme partiality of these Fathers, they make it impossible for the Acts of one Consecration to be lost or stollen, and yet accuse us of forging fifteen Consecrations. It is easier to steale fifteen, then to Forge one Act.

We have often asked a reason of them, why

why the Protestants should decline their own Consecrations? They give us one, *The truth is, that* Barlow *as most of the Clergy in* England *in those times were Puritans, and inclined to Zuinglianisme, therefore they contemned and rejected Consecration as a rag of Rome, and were contented with the extraordinary calling of God and the Spirit, as all other Churches are, who pretend Reformation.* It is well they premised *the truth is*, otherwise there had not been one word of truth in what they say. First how do they know this? It must be either by Relation, but I am confident they can name no author for it: or by Revelation, but that they may not doe: or it is (to speake sparingly) their own Imagination. It is a great boldnesse, to take the liberty to cast aspersions upon the Clergy of a whole Nation. Secondly, how commeth Bishop *Barlow*, to be taxed of Puritanism? we meet him a Prior and a Bishop, we find him in his Robes, in his Rochet, in his Cope, Officiating, Ordaining, Confirming. He who made no scruple to Ordein and Consecrate others *gratis*, certainly did not forbeare his own Consecration with the apparent hazard of the losse of his Bishoprick, out of scru-

ple of Conſcience. Thirdly, this aſperſion is not well accommodated to the times. For firſt Zuinglianiſme was but ſhort heeled in thoſe Dayes when Bishop *Barlow* was Conſecrated, who ſate in Parliament as a Conſecrated Bishop 31. Henr. 8: and the firſt Sermon that ever Zuinglius Preached as a Probationer, was in *Zurick* in the yeare 1510, that was in the 10, or 11. yeare of Hēry the eighth. If there were any one Zuinglian in thoſe dayes, upon their grounds, it is moſt likely to have been Bishop *Gardiner*, for his Conſecration doth not appeare more then Bishop *Barlowes*.

But there is yet a greater miſtake in it; it is the Anabaptiſts who *reject Ordination, and content themſelves with the extraordinary calling of the Spirit*, not the *Zuinglians*. In the writings of *Zuinglius* we fiud a Letter of him and ten other of the principall *Helvetian* Theologians, to the Bishop of *Conſtance*; beſeeching him in all humility and obſervance, *to favour and help forward their beginnings, as an excellent work and worthy of a Bishop*; They implore his *Clemency, Wiſdome, learning, that he would be the firſt fruits of the German Bishops*; They beſeech him *by the Common Chriſt, by that fatherly affection which he owes unto them, to looke graci-*

ouſly

ously upon them &c; They court him *to shew himself a Father, and grant the request of his obedient sonnes.* *Zuinglius* and the *Zuinglians* liked Bishops well enough, if he could have had them. But the Bishop of *Constance* of another Communion was their Bishop.

Here Meanderlike they make a winding from St. *Asaph* back again to Cheapside, from Bishop *Barlowes* Consecration to Archbishop Parkers. They say, that *if there had been any other Consecration of Archbishop Parker then that of the Nagges head, Iohn Stow would not conceale it in his Annales*; who is so diligent in *setting down all that passed in and about London, and professeth personall respect to him, he having related the Consecration of Cardinall* Pole *with so many particulars.* They adde out of Dr. *Champney*, that Iohn Stow *acknowledged to many persons that the story of the Nagges head was true.* Their store is very low, when they are forced to produce *Iohn Stow*, who scarce knew what a Consecration was. But what saith he in his Chronicles? Not a word, either of the feigned Consecration at the *Nagges head*, or of the true Consecration at *Lambeth*. But *he told it to many persons by word of mouth, that the Story of the Nagges head was very true.* If he did, he lied notoriously

to many persons, but we acquit him of that calumny: let it rest upon them, who think it a meritorious Act, to advance religion by any means true or false, we are too well acquainted with their hearsay reports. They who dare wrest his printed workes, ought not to be trusted what he spake by word of mouth, to some body, whom no body knowes. Their Authour saith *to some persons*, they say *to many persons*, thus this snowball increaseth. *John Stowe* is now dead, and dead men do not bite: yet let us know to whom he said it? Doctor *Champney* tells us, *they are timorous and would not be named.* Good reason, for they have no names: so *John Stow* is a silent witnesse, and they are nameless witnesses.

So much for the man: now for the thing I give three answers; First if *John Stow* were a lover of the truth, he should rather have set down the *Nagges head* Ordination (if there was any such thing) then the *Lambeth* Ordination. Men would suppose the Lambeth Ordination of themselves, where nothing is said to the contrary, it is presumed for the Law: but the *Nagges head* Consecration, had been such a Consecration, as never was before, never will follow after.

Secondly, their Authours wrest *John Stow*

Stow abhominably. He was no profeſt writer of Eccleſiaſticall Annales. It is true, he mentioneth the Conſecration of Cardinall *Pole*, whether it was his reſpect to his Eminence, as being a neare Kinsman to the Queen, a Cardinall, the Popes Legate, and his grand Miniſter for the reconciliation of *England*, or becauſe a toy tooke him in the head: but not with ſo many particulars as the Fathers intimate; all he ſaith is this, *the 21 of March* Dr. Cranmer *Archbiſhop of* Canterbury *was burnt at* Oxford, *the ſame day Cardinall* Pole *ſang his firſt Maſſe at* Greenwich *in the Friars* Church, *on Sunday next he was Conſecrated Archbiſhop of* Canterbury (here was ſpeedy worke), *and the 25 of March received the Pall with the uſuall Ceremonies at Bowes Church in* Cheape. Here is another *Nagges head* meeting; where he was Conſecrated, by whom, after what Form, he leaveth the Reader to preſume: but of all the other Conſecrations performed in Queen *Maries* time, this diligent Authour mentioneth not ſo much as one; of all the Conſecrations in Queen Elizabeths time, I think not one; of all the Conſecrations in *England* ſince the Conqueſt, not one, or ſo rarely that they are not to be taken notice of. If the Argument of theſe Fathers were of any value

John Stow mentioneth not his Consecration at *Lambeth*, therefore he was not Consecrated there, we never had a Consecration in *England*, since the Conqueſt, but Cardinal *Poles*: for he mentioneth none but that which I remember, I am ſure if he mention any it is moſt rarely. If the Fathers argument were good, Archbiſhop *Parker* was never elected, nor confirmed, becauſe his Election and Confirmation are not recordsd by *John Stow*: but all our Records Civil as well as Eccleſiaſticall do teſtify the Contrary.

Laſtly, if the Fathers would lay aſide their prejudice, there is enough in *Iohn Stowes* Annales, to diſcover the falſhood of their lying Fable of the Conſecration at the *Nagges head*. By their account the *Nagges head* Conſecration was September 7. Anno 1559, but after this in relating the ſolemne Obſequies kept in St. *Pauls* Church, for the French King, *John Stow* calleth him, Dr. *Parker Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury Elect*, therefore the *Nagges head* Conſecration is a lying Fable; if he was ſtill Elect, he was not then Conſecrated. But afterward ſpeaking of his Death May 17. 1575, which is the next time I find him mentioned, he ſtileth him the *right Reverend Father*

er in God Matthew Parker *Dr. of Divi-*
ty Archbishop of Caterbury. Here is no more
he word *Elect*, for after Confirmation and
Consecration, the word Elect ceaseth, here
e is complete *Archbishop of Canterbury*.

They say, *they who make no Conscience to falsify Scripture will forge Records*: And *how notorionsly the English Clergy have falsified Scripture, is Demonstrated by Gregory Martin*. I hope none of us did ever attempt to purge *St. Pauls* Epistles, because there were in them, *Quadam male sonantia*, *Somethings that sounded not well*, in the point of Iustification. We desire good words, untill they be able to prove their allegation. Rather then be accounted falsifiers of Scripture, we are contented to stand to the vulgar Latin, in any Controversy between them and us. But who is the man doth accuse us of so many Falsifications? One *Gregory Martin*, one of their fellowes, whose censure we do not weigh a button. This is a new Inartificiall Kind of arguing, from the Authority of their own Writers.

But they use it much, so it followeth in the next words, *it is want of Charity to think that* Stapleton, Harding, Bristow *and the rest of the English Catholick Doctors, who did*

forsake all at home for Conscience sake, would publish to the world in print, the Nullity of Parkers Ordination; thereby engaging posterity to commit so many damnable Sacrileges, in reordeining those who had been validly ordeined already, without due examination of the matter.

This plea is much like that of the old Roman, that his Adversary, did not receive the wound with his whole body, that he might have killed him fairly. They would have us rather put up the losse of our Holy Orders, then the skill of their Doctors should be questioned. If Reordinatiõ be *damnable Sacrilege*, the Authority of your own Doctors may be a fit *medium* to convince yourselves of Sacrilege, not us of the Invalidity of our Ordination. I hope *Stephen* the sixth and *Sergius* the third, two Popes, were other manner of men then your English Doctors, and did both pretend to examine the matter as duely, and to be as averse from damnable Sacrilege as you, yet they decreed publickly, and most unjustly, (as you yourselves doe now confesse) that all the holy Orders received from *Formosus* were void, and compelled all those who had been ordeined by him, to be reordeined. *Bell. de Rom. Pont. l.4. cap. 12.*

Mr. Mason cited the Testimony of a wit-

witnesse beyond all exception, *Charles Howard* Earle of *Nottingham*, Lord High Admirall of *England*, who acknowledged Archbishop *Parker* to be his Kinsman, and that he was an invited Guest at his Cōsecration at *Lambeth*. To this the Fathers reply, *If this were true, it proves onely that there was a good Dinner at* Lambeth, *which might well be to conceale the shamefull Consecration at the* Nagges head. It proves there was a good Consecration, as well as a good Dinner, the words are *to honour his Consecration, and the solemnity thereof with his presence.* It had been something uncivill, to encumber the Tavern with a Consecration, and not stay dinner there. The Earle was invited to the Consecration, at *Lambeth*, therefore it was at *Lambeth*, The Earle was not at the *Nagges head*; Mr. *Neale* himself, who see more then ever was acted, or so much as thought of, did not see that. Is it the Custome when one is invited to a Consecration, to come after it is done to dinner: or to invite a Nobleman to a Consecration in one place, and then be consecrated in another? This had been so farre from concealing the shamefulnesse of such a brainsick Consecration, that it been a ready meanes to divulge it to all the world.

They

They adde, *Besides we must take the Earles Friends word for the Earles Testimony*, and Mr. Masons *word for his nameleſſe Friend*. That is none of *Mr. Masons* fault, but Mr. *Holywoods*, *Mr. Conſtables*, *Mr. Sacrobſcoes*, *Dr. Champneys*, *Mr. Fitz-Herberts*, *Mr Fitz-Simons*, who firſt broached this odious Fable. *Mr. Maſon* published this relation to the world in print while the Earle was yet living, on purpoſe that they might enquire and ſatisfy themſelves; if they did not, they can blame no body but themſelves; if they did by themſelves or their Friends, (as it is moſt likely they did) it is evident the anſwer did not content them, and ſo we never heard more of them ſince. It had been the greateſt folly in the world to allege the Teſtimony of ſuch a Noble man in his Life time, contrary to his own knowledge, which might have been diſproved from his own Authority, and ſo have eaſily laid *Mr. Maſon* flat upon his back. You may remember your own caſe with the Biſhop of *Durham*. But it was too true to be contradicted then, and too late to be Contradicted now.

They ſay, *they bring more then one witneſſe of the* Nagges head *Conſecration*. Pardon me, You never produced one yet, and which is leſſe then producing, you never ſo much

as

named a witneſſe, whilſt he himſelf as living. In or about the yeare 603. you firſt named *Mr. Neale* and innocent *Iohn* Stow, when they were both dead; you might as well have named the man in the Moone as *Iohn Stow*. Onely I confeſſe you named the Biſhop of *Durham* in his life time, and you ſee what is the iſſue of it: and if you had named the others in their life times, you muſt have expected a like iſſue, either the perpetuall infamy of your witneſſe, or the utter confuſion of your Cauſe. You ſpeake much of *the learning, and virtue, and judgement* of your hearſay Witneſſes, *who knew how to diſtinguiſh between an Epiſcopall Conſecration, and a banquet.* I hope you doe not meane that the Earle of *Nottingham* did not know, how to diſtinguiſh between a banquet and a Conſecration, if he did not, the High Admiralſhip of England was ill committed to him: or that he had not as much regard to his honour and Conſcience, as any of your Prieſts. We meddle not with their Learning and virtue, but we are no more obliged to take their Teſtimonies upon hearſay, then they would take our Teſtimonies. They have giv̄e an account to God, and know before this time whether they have

have done well or ill..

They proceed, *The Prieſts and Ieſuits, to whom the Recordes were ſhewed in King Iames his time, proteſted againſt them as forged and improbable, as appeareth by the Teſtimony of men yet living, whoſe honeſty cannot be called in queſtion. Father* Faircloth, *one of the impriſoned Ieſuits, teſtified ſo much to many by word of mouth and in writting.* Where is the writing? where is the proteſtation? why are they not produced? Still here are no prooſes but upon Hearſay. One eye Witneſſe is worth an hundred ſuch, who can ſweare to no more but that they heard it, and God knowes through how many Huckſters hands. I hope the Biſhop of *Durhams* caſe will make them more wary for the future.

But they are angry with *ſome Proteſtants who endeavour to make this well grounded ſtory a meer Fable, and thereby call many perſons of much more learning, virtue, and prudence then themſelves Fooles or knaves.* We are plain *Macedonians*, who call a Fable a Fable, without either welt or gard: yea, ſo notorious a Fable, that (but that you tellus the Contrary), we could not believe that any one of you did ever give any credit to it your ſelves; any more then the *Athenians* did believe thoſe monſtrous Fables of Bulls

and

and Minotaures, which themſelves had raiſed, becauſe ſome of their eminent Citizens had deviſed it or related it: But we call no men *Fooles or Knaues*, That language is too unmannerly for civill Writers. What new Topick is this, becauſe we cannot beleeve armans relation or his Iudgement, do we ſtraightway call him Foole or Knave? Excuſe me, there are credulity, and prejudice, and miſtakes, and pious frauds in the world, and none of theſe will willingly weare the Livery of Knaves or Fooles. We are not of the ſame mind with Pope *Stephen* and Pope *Sergius*, for the recordeining of thoſe, who had been ordeined by *Formoſus*, yet we do not call them *Knaves or Fooles*. We cannot beleeve what you yourſelves have related of my Lord of *Durham*, yet we are not guilty of ſuch extravagant expreſſions.

CAP.

CAP. IX.

The Fathers insist too much upon the Authority of their own party, Why Consecration is not mentioned at Restitution, The exactness of our Records justified.

IT seemeth to me, that the Fathers insist too much upon the honesty, and virtue, and learning of their own party: In dispute with an Adversary, virtue is like fire, which preserveth it self by being covered with ashes: but spread abroad by ostentation, it is quickly extinguished; especially Comparisons are odious, and beget altercation. We say, there is not a Hill so high in *Lincolnshire*, but there is another within a Mile as high as it: take you the reputation of learning and prudence, so you leave us the better cause; and we shall be able to defēd it well enough against you. But the maine defect in this part of your discourse is this, the Bishop of *Chalcedon* confesseth of Mr. *Oldcorn*, one of your Order, that he acknowledged these Records to be Authentick, and the rest of the impri-

imprisoned Priests, who viewed the Records, are charged publickly in print to have done the same, by Bishop Goodwin, by Mr. Mason; every thing ought to be unlooſed the same way it is bound. They were all Schollars and could write, if this charge were not true, they ought to have published a Protestation to the world in print to the contrary, whileſt their Adversaries were living, whileſt the Witneſſes were living: but now after they and their Adversaries, and the witneſſes are all ſo long dead, to talke of a verball proteſtation of ſome of their Friends, upon hearſay, ſignifieth nothing.

Now we muſt make another winding, and return to Bishop *Barlow*: but I hold to the clue, in hope at length to get out of this fictitious Labyrinth. *Henry the* 8. *Letters Patents, vvhereby Bishop* Barlow *vvas installed in* (they would ſay reſtored to) *the Temporalties of his Bishoprick, make mention of his acceptation and Confirmation, but none of his Conſecration. Why ſhould this laſt be omitted, if he were really conſecrated?* This objectiō sheweth nothing, but the unſkilfulneſſe of the Fathers in our English Cuſtomes and Forms.

Let them compare all the reſtitutions of their friends to their Temporalties in England, as Cardinall *Poles*, Biſhop *Gardiners* and the reſt, and they ſhall find the Form the very ſame with Biſhop *Barlowes*; I hope they will not conclude thence that none of them were conſecrated. The reaſon of the Forme is very prudent, In a Reſtitution to Temporalties, they take no notice of any Acts that are purely Spirituall, as Conſecration is: but onely of ſuch Acts as are Temporall, as Acceptation and Confirmation.

But *if he was reſtored to his Temporalties not being Conſecrated, he might alſo ſit in Parliament without Conſecration.* The Aſſumtion is underſtood, *but Biſhop* Barlow *was reſtored to his Temporalties without Conſecration*; which is moſt falſe. From the Converſion of the Nation untill this Day, they are not able to produce one inſtance, of one Biſhop, who was duely Elected, duely confirmed, and duely reſtored to his Temporalties by the Kings Mandate, without Conſecration, or did ſit in Parliament without Conſecration. He muſt ſit in Parliament in his Epiſcopall habit, but that cannot be before Conſecration. It ſeemeth they think that Biſhops ſit in Parliament, as Temporall

orall Barons: but it a great miſtake, Bi-
hops ſate in the Great Councells of the
ingdome, before the names of Parlia-
ent or Barons were heard of in *England*.
They bring an Argument from *the exact-*
neſſe of our Records, and that connexion that
between Records of one Court and ano-
er. The firſt thing neceſſary to obtein a
ishoprick iu *England*, is the Kings *Conge*
eſlire; that appears in the Rolles. Next,
he actuall Election; that appeares in the
ecords of the Dean and Chapiter. Third-
, the Kings Acceptation of the Election,
d his Commiſſion to the Archbishop, or
ur Bishops in the Vacancy, to Confirm
e Election and Conſecrate the perſon E-
cted and Confirmed legally; that appeares
the Letters Patents enrolled. Fourth-
, the Confirmation of the Election be-
re the Dean of the Arches, but by the
rchbishops appointment, (this is perfor-
ed alwaies in *Bow* Church, except extra-
dinarily it be performed elſwhere by
ommiſſion); this appeares in the Records
the Archbishop. Fifthly, the Conſe-
ration it ſelf by the Archbishop and other
ishops, or other Bishops without him by
irtue of his Commiſſion; this appeares in
he Records of the Protonothary of the See

of Canterbury. Laſtly the Reſtitution of the Temporalties; which appeares in the Rolles, and his Enthroniſation in the Records of the Dean and Chapiter. Every one of theſe takes another by the hand, and he who will enjoy a Bishoprick in *England*, muſt have them all. The Chapiter cannot elect without the Kings *Conge d'Eſlire*. The King never grants his Letters Patents for Confirmation and Conſecration, untill he have a Certificate of the Deã and Chapiters Electiõ. The Dean of the *Arches* never confirms, untill he have the Kings Commiſſion. The Archbishop never Conſecrates untill the Election be confirmed. And laſtly the King never receiveth Homage for the Bishoprick, or giveth the Temporalties, not the Deã and Chapiter Enthrone, untill after Conſecration. He that hath any one of theſe acts, muſt of Neceſſity have all that goe before it in this Method: and he that hath the laſt, hath them all. But this was more then Mr. Neale, or whoſoever was Inventer of that ſilly Fable, did underſtãd, otherwiſe he would have framed a more poſſible relatiõ.

Hence they argue, The Records *being ſo exact, how is it poſſible that no Copies of Barlowes Conſecration do appeare in any Court or Bishoprick of* England? They miſtake the matter wholy, the Conſecration ought not to ap-

ppeare in any Court but one, that is that
egiſtry where he was Conſecrated, which
eing not certainly known, at ſo great a
iſtance of time, is not ſo eaſily found, and I
elieve was never ſought for yet further thē
Lambeth. But all the other Acts doe appeare
n their proper Courts; The Kings Licen-
e, the Dean and Chapiters Election, the
ings Letters Patents, the Confirmation of
he Dean of the Arches, which all goe be-
ore Conſecration; and his doing Homage,
nd the Reſtitution of him to his Tempo-
alties, and his Enthroniſation, all which
o follow the Conſecration, and are infal-
ible proofes in Law of the Conſecration:
s likewiſe his ſitting in Parliament, his Or-
eining of Prieſts, his Conſecrating of Bi-
hops, his letting of Leaſes, his receiving
fHeriditamēts to him and his Succeſſours,
is exchanging of Lands; all which are as
refragable proofes of his Conſecration,
s any man hath to prove that ſuch perſons
ere his Parents, either Father or Mother.
nd whē the right Regiſter is ſought, which
uſt be by the help of the Court of Faculties,
doubt not but his Conſecration will be
ound in the proper place, as all the reſt are.
Mr. Maſon alleged, that Biſhop *Gardiners*
Conſecration was not to be found in the
Regiſter of *Lambeth*, any more then Bi-

shop *Barlowes*: yet no man doubted of his Ordination. They anſwer firſt, that Mr. Maſon did not ſeek ſo ſolicitonsly or diligently *for Bishop* Gardiners *Conſecration as for Bishop* Barlowes. Then why do not they whom it doth concern, cauſe more diligent ſearch to be made? without finding the Records of Bishop *Gardiners* Conſecration, they cannot accuſe Bishop *Barlow* of want of Conſecration, upon that onely reaſon. Secondly they anſwer that if Gardiners *Conſecration, were as doubtfull as* Barlowes *and* Parkers, *they would take the ſame adviſe they give us, to repaire and ſpeed to ſome other Church of undoubted Clergy.* Yes, where will they find a more undoubted Clergy? They may goe further and fare worſe. *Rome* itſelf hath not more exact Records, nor a more uudoubted Succeſſion, then the Church of *England*. There is no reaſon in the world to doubt either of Archbishop *Parkers* Conſecration, or Bishop *Gardiners*, or Bishop *Barlowes*. Neither doth his Conſecration concern us ſo much, at the Fathers imagine there were three Conſecraters (which is the Canonicall number) beſides him.

It is high time for the Fathers to wind up, and draw to a Concluſion of this Argumēt. That which followeth next is too high

d can ſcarcely be tolerated ; to accuſe e publick Records and Archives of the ingdome, and to inſimulate the Primates d Metropolitans of *England* of Forgery, on no ground but their own Imaginatiõ. doubt whether they durſt offer it to a wi- ow Woman. *As to the impoſſibility f forging ſo many Regiſters, in caſe there e ſo many, it is eaſily anſwered, that it no more then that the Conſecraters nd other perſons concerned, ſhould ave conſpired to give in a falſe Certifi- ate, that the Conſecration was perfor- ed with all due Cerimonies and Rites, nd thereby deceive the Courts or make hem diſſemble.* Should any man accuſe he Generall of their order, or one of their rovincialls, or but the Rector of one of heir Colleges, of Forgery and counterfei- ing the publick Records of the Order ; ow would they ſtorm, and thunder, and mingle heaven and earth together and cry ut, *No moderate or prudent perſons an ſuſpect that ſuch perſons ſhould damne their ſoules, that ſo many pious learned Divines ſhould engage them- ſelves and their poſterity, in damnable Sacrileges, without feare of damnation.*

If a man will not believe every ridiculous Fable, which they tell by word of mouth upon hearsay, they *call persons of more vertue learning and prudence then themselves, Fooles and Knaves*: But they may insimulate the principall Fathers of our Church, of certifying most pernicious lyes under their hands and seales, not for a piece of bread, which is a poore temptatiō, but for nothing, that is to make them both *Fooles and Knaves*. Is not this blowing hot and cold with the same breath? *or to have the Faith of our Lord Iesus Christ with respect of persons?* Compare the politicall principles of the Church of *England* with your own, and try if you can find any thing so pernicious to mankind and all humane Society, in ours more then in yours. Compare the Case Theology of the Church of *England*, with your own, and try if you can find any thing so destructive to Morality, to truth, and Iustice, and Conscience, as might lead us to perpetrate such Crimes more then yourselves. We are not affraid of a Paralell. You professe great endeavours to make Proselites; we do not condemne Zeale, yet wish you had more light with it: even in prudence, which you yourselves extoll, this is not your right Course, to follow those Birds, with noise and clamour, which you desire to catch.

In

In ſumme, your anſwer or ſolution is full of ignorant miſtakes. It confoundeth Civill Rolles and Eccleſiaſticall Regiſters. It ſuppoſeth that our Records are but tranſcriptions, one out of another; whereas every Court recordeth its own Acts, and keeps itſelf within its own bounds. It taketh notice but of one Conſecrater: where as we have alwaies three at the leaſt, many times five or ſix. It quite forgetteth publick Notaries, which muſt be preſent at every Conſecration with us, to draw up what is done into Acts; with us every one of theſe Notaries when he is admitted to that charge, doth take a ſolemne Oath upon his knees to diſcharge his Office faithfully, that is, not to make falſe Certificates. Secondly, it is abſurd and unſeaſonable, to enquire how a thing came to paſſe that never was: you ought Firſt to have proved, that our Records were forged, and then it had been more ſeaſonable to have enquired modeſtly, how it came to paſſe. Thirdly, it is incredible, that perſons of ſuch prudence and æminence, ſhonld make falſe Certificates under their hands and ſeales, to the utter ruine of themſelves and all that had a hand it, and no advantage to any perſon breathing. It is incredible that thoſe

Records

Records should be counterfeited in a corner, which were avowed publickly for Authentick by the whole Parliament of *England* in the 8 yeare of Queen *Elisabeth*, which were published to the world in print by the person most concerned, as if he desired all the world to except against them: and yet no man offered to except against them then. Fourthly, it is impossible to give in a false Certificate of a Consecration which was never performed in *England*, (especially at *Lambeth*) before lesse then thousands of eye witnesses: and that at *Lambeth*, in the Face of the Court and Westminster Hall. Surely they thinke we consecrate in Closets, or holes, or haymowes. They may even as well say that the publick Acts of our Parliaments are counterfeited, and the publick Acts of our Synods are counterfeited, and all our publick monuments counterfeited. It is none of the honestest Pleas, *Negare factum*, to deny such publick Acts as these. Fifthly, this answer is pernicious to mankind, it is destructive to all Societies of men, that Bishops of so great eminence, should conspire with publick Notaries, to give in false Certificates, in a matter of such High Consequence as Holy Orders are, without any temptation,

with

without any hope of Advantage to themſelves or others. It affordeth a large Seminary for jealouſies and ſuſpicions. It exterminateth all credit and confidence out of the world, and inſtructeth all men to truſt nothing, but what they ſee with their eyes. Laſtly, it is contradictory to themſelves; They have told us, I know not how often, and tell us again in this Paragraph, That *if the* Nagges head *Conſecration had been falſe, they might have convinced it by a thouſand witneſſes*: Here they make it an eaſy thing, for *the Conſecraters and other perſons concerned, to conſpire together to give in a falſe Certificate, that the Conſecration was performed with all due Ceremonies and Rites*, and thereby deceive the *Courts or make them diſſemble*. If the world will be deceived ſo, it is but right and reaſon that it be deceived; to be deceived by a falſe Certificate, that may be convinced by a thouſand witneſſes, is ſelfdeceit.

But they ſay, *this is more poſſible and more probable, then that all the Clergy ſhould conſpire not to produce the ſame Regiſters, when they were ſo hardly preſſed by their Adverſaries*. Theſe are but empty pretenſes, there was no preſſing to produce Regiſters, nor any thing objected that did deſerve the production of

of a Regiſter. That which was objected againſt our Orders in thoſe dayes was about the Form of Ordination published by Edward the ſixth, and the Legality of our Ordination in the time of Queen *Eliſabeth*; the *Nagges head* Conſecration was never objected in thoſe dayes. Beſides, Regiſters are Publick enough themſelves, and need no production; and yet our Regiſters were produced, produced by the Parliament 8 *Eliſab.* who cited them as authentick Records, produced and published to the world in Print, that was another production.

They adde, *Or that ſo many Catholicks ſhould have been ſo foolish to invent or maintein the Story of the* Nagges head, *in ſuch a time when if it had been falſe, they might have been convinced by a thouſand Witneſſes.* Feare them not, they were wiſer then to publish ſuch a notorious Fable in thoſe dayes; they might perchance whiſper it in Corners among themſelves, but the boldeſt of them durſt not maintain it, or object it in print, for feare of ſhame and disgrace. It was folly to give any eare to it, but is was knavery to invent it: and to doe it after ſuch a bungling manner, (whoſoever was the Inventer) was knavery and Folly complicated together.

If

If the Fathers write any more upon this ſubject, I deſire them to bring us no more *hearesay* teſtimonies of their owne party; whatſoever eſteeme they may have themſelves, of their judgment, and prudence, and impartiality. It is not the manner of Polemick writers to urge the authority of their owne Doctors to an Adverſary, or allege the moderne practiſe of their preſent Church. We have our owne Church and our owne Doctors as well as they. If we would pinne our faith to the ſleeues of their Writers, and ſubmit to their judgments, and beleeve all their reportes, and let all things be as they would have it, we needed not to have any more controverſy with them: but we might well raiſe a worſe controverſy in our ſelves with our owne conſciences.

CAP.

CHA. XI.

Of our formes of Epiſcopall and prieſtly ordination, of Zuinglianiſme. of Arch Biſhop Lavvd, of ceremonies. Our aſſurance of our Orders.

WE have done with the Nagges head for the preſent. That which followeth next doth better become Schollers, as having more shew of truth and reality in it. They object that *in all the Catholick Ritualls, not onely of the weſt but of the Eaſt, there is not one forme of conſecrating Biſhops, that hath not the word Biſhops in it, or ſome other words expreſſing the particular authority and power of a Biſhop diſtinctly. But in our Conſecration, there is not one word to expreſſe the difference and power of Epiſcopacy. For theſe vvordes* [*receive the holy Ghoſt*] *are indifferent to prieſthood and Epiſcopacy, and uſed in both Ordinations.* I anſwer, that the forme of Epiſcopall Ordination uſed at the ſame time when hands are impoſed, is the ſame both in their forme and ours, [*Receive the holy Ghoſt*]. And if theſe words be conſidered

ngly in a divided ſenſe from the reſt of e Office, there is nothing either in our rme or theirs which doth diſtinctly and ciprocally expreſſe Epiſcopall power and uthority. But if theſe words be conſidered niointly in a compounded ſenſe, there enough to expreſſe Episcopall power d authority diſtinctly, and as much in ur forme as theirs.

Firſt two Bishops preſent the Bishop ect to the Arch-Bishop of the Province, ith theſe words, *moſt Reverend Father in hriſt, we preſent to you this godly and learned an to be Conſecrated Bishop.* There is one xpreſſion.

Then the Arch-Bishop cauſeth the ings Letters Patents to be produced and ead, which require the Arch Bishop to onſecrate him a *Bishop.* There is a ſecond xpreſſion.

Thirdly the new Bishop takes his oath f canonicall obedience. *I A B elected Bishop of the Church and See of* C. *do profeſſe and promiſe all reverence and due obedience to the Arch Bishop and Metropoliticall Church of D. and his Succeſſours. So God help me &c.* This is a third Expreſſion.

Next the Arch Bishop exhorts the whole Aſſembly to ſolemne praier for this perſon thus elected and preſented, before they

they admit him to that office (that is t
Office of a Bishop,) whereunto they ha
he is called by the holy Ghost, after t
example of Christ before he did chuse h
Apostles, and the church of Antioch bef
they laid hands upon Paul and Barnab
This is a fourth expression.

Then followeth the *Litany*, where
there is this expresse petition for the pe
son to be ordeined Bishop, *we beseech th
to give thy blessing and grace to this our bro
elected Bishop, that he may discharge that o
whereunto he is called diligently to the Ed
cation of thy Church.* To which all th
congregation answer, *Heare us O Lord
beseech thee.* Here is a fifth expression.

Then followeth this praier wherewi
the *Litany* is concluded. *Allmighty Go
the giver of all good things, which by thy ho
Spirit hast constituted diverse orders of Mi
sters in thy Church, vouchsafe we beseech th
to looke graciously upon this thy servant, no
called to the Office of a Bishop.* This is a sixth
expression.

Next the Arch-Bishop telleth him he
must examine him, before he admit him
to that administratiõ whereunto he is cal-
led, and maketh a solemne praier for him,
that *God who hath constituted some Propheis,
some Apostles &c. to the Edification of his*

Church

Church, would grant to this his ſervant the grace to uſe the authority committed to him, to edification not deſtruction, to diſtribute food in due ſeaſon to the family of Chriſt, as becommeth a faithfull and prudent Steward. This authority can be no other then Epiſcopall authority, nor this Stewardship any other thing then Episcopacy. This is a ſevēth expreſſiō.

Then followeth impoſition of hands, by the Arch-Biſhop and all the Biſhops preſent, with theſe words *Receive the holy Ghoſt* &c: and laſtly the tradition of the Bible into his hands, exhorting him *to behave himſelf towards the flock of Chriſt, as a Paſtour, not devouring but feeding the flock.* All this implieth Epiſcopall authority. They may except againſt Chriſts owne forme of ordeining his Apoſtles if they will, and againſt the forme uſed by their owne Church: but if they be ſufficient formes, our forme is ſufficient. This was the ſame forme which was uſed in Edward the ſixths time, and we have ſeen how Cardinall Pole and Paul the fourth confirmed all without exception, that were ordeined according to this forme; ſo they would reunite themſelves to the Roman Catholick Church.

They bring the very ſame objection againſt our Prieſtly Ordination, *The forme*

or words whereby men are made Priests must expresse authority and power to consecrate, or make present Christs body and blood, (whether with or without transubstantiation is not the present controversy with Protestants.) Thus far we accorde, to the truth of the presence of Christs body and blood; So they leave us this latitude for the manner of his presence. Abate us Transubstantiation, and those things which are consequents of their determination of the manner of presence, and we have no difference with them in this particular. They who are ordeined Priests, ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, that is, to make them present after such manner as they were present at the first institution; whether it be done by enunciation of the words of Christ, as it is observed in the westerne Church, or by praier, as it is practised in the Easterne Church: or whether these two be both the same thing in effect, that is, that the formes of the Sacraments be mysticall praiers and implicite invocations. Our Church for more abundant caution useth both formes, as well in the Consecration of the Sacrament, as in the ordination of Priests. In the holy Eucharist, our consecration is a repetition of that which was done by Christ, and now done by

y him that conſecrateth in the perſon of hriſt; otherwiſe the Prieſt could not ſay is is my body. And likewiſe in Epiſcopall onſecration, *Homo imponit manus, deus lar-itur gratiam, Sacerdos imponit ſupplicem dex-ram, Deus benedicit potente dextera: Man mpoſeth hands, God conferreth grace, The ishop impoſeth his ſuppliant right hand, God leſſeth with his Almighty right hand.* In oth conſecrations Chriſt himſelf is the hiefe conſecrater ſtill, Then if power of onſecratiõ be nothing els but power to do hat which Chriſt did, and ordeined to be one, our Prieſts want not power to conſe-rate. They adde, *in all formes of Ordeining Prieſts, that ever were uſed in the Eaſterne or Weſterne Church, is expreſly ſet downe the word Prieſt, or ſome other words expreſſing the proper unction and authority of* Prieſthood *&c. The Grecians uſing the word* Prieſt *or Bishop in their formes, do ſufficiently expreſſe the reſpective po-wer of every Order. But our Reformers did not put into the forme of ordeining Prieſts, any words expreſſing authority to make Chriſts body preſent.* I anſwer, that if by formes of ordeining Prieſts, they underſtãd that eſſentiall forme of words, which is uſed at the ſame inſtant of time whileſt hands are impoſed, I denie that in all formes of Prieſtly ordination, the word Prieſt is ſet downe either expreſly

or æquivalently. It is ſet downe expreſly in the Eaſterne Church, it is not ſet downe expreſly in the Weſterne Church. Both the Eaſterne and Weſterne formes are lawfull, but the Weſterne commeth nearer to the inſtitution of Chriſt.

But if by formes of Ordeining, they underſtand Ordinalls or Rituals, or the intire forme of ordeining: both our Church and their Church have not onely æquivalent expreſſions of Prieſtly power, but even the expreſſe word *Prieſt* it ſelf, which is ſufficient both to direct and to expreſſe the intention of the Conſecrater. Vnder that name the Arch Deacon preſēteth them, *Right Reverend Father in Chriſt, I preſent unto you theſe perſons here preſent, to be admitted to the Order of Prieſthood.* Vnder that name the Biſhop admitteth them, *well beloved brethren, theſe are they whom we purpoſe by the grace of God this day to admit* [cooptare] *into the holy office of Prieſthood.* Vnder this name the whole aſſembly praieth for them, *Almighty God, vouchſafe we beſeech thee to look graciouſly upon theſe thy ſervants, which this day are called to the office of Prieſthood.* It were to be wished, that writers of Controverſies would make more uſe of their owne eyes, and truſt leſſe other mens citations.

Secondly I anſwer, that it is not neceſſa-

ry

ry, that the eſſeutiall formes of Sacraments should be alwaies ſo very expreſſe and determinate, that the words are not capable of extenſion to any other matter: if they be as determinate and expreſſe, as the example and preſcriptiou of Chriſt, it is ſufficient. The forme of baptiſme is, *I baptiſe the in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*: Not I baptiſe the to *Regeneration*, or for *Remiſſion of ſins*. There are many other kinds of baptiſmes or waſhings, beſides this Sacramentall baptiſme: yet this forme is as large as the inſtitution of Chriſt. And theſe generall words are efficacious both to regeneration and remiſſion of ſinnes, as well as if regeneration and remiſſion of ſins had bene expreſly mentioned. In this forme of baptiſme, there is enough antecedent to direct and regulate both the actions and intentions of the Miniſter: So there is likewiſe in our forme of Ordination.

Thirdly I anſwer, that in our very eſſentiall forme of Prieſtly Ordination, Prieſtly power and authority is ſufficiently expreſſed; we need not ſeeke for a needle in a bottle of hay. The words of our Ordinall are cleare enough. Firſt *Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, (That is the grace of the holy Ghoſt) *to exerciſe and dicharge the Office of Prieſthood*

hood, to which thou haſt been now preſented, to which thou haſt been now accepted, and for which we have praied to God, that in it thou maieſt diſſcharge thy duty faithfully and acceptably.

Secondly, in theſe words, *whoſe ſins thou doeſt remit they are remitted,* that is not onely by Prieſtly abſolution: but by preaching, by baptiſing, by adminiſtring the holy Euchariſt, which is a meanes to applie the alſufficient ſacrifice of Chriſt, for the remiſſion of Sinnes. He who authoriſeth a man to accomplish a worke, doth authoriſe him to uſe all meanes which tend to the accomplishment thereof.

That which is objected, that *Laymen have power to remit ſinnes by Baptiſme, but no power to conſecrate,* ſignifieth nothing as to this point. For firſt their owne Doctors do acknowledge, that *a Lay man can not baptiſe ſolemnely, nor in the preſence of a Prieſt or a Deacon, nor in their abſence, except onely in caſe of neceſſity.* Saint *Auſtin* gives the reaſon, becauſe *no man may invade another mans office.* Laymen may, and are bound to inſtruct others in caſe of neceſſity: yet the office of preaching and inſtructing others is Conferred by Ordination. The ordinary office of remitting ſinnes, both by baptiſme and by the holy Euchariſt, doth belong to Bishops and under thē to Prieſts.

Bell. de Sac. Bapt. l. 1. c. 7.

Thirdly

Thirdly, this Prieſtly power to conſecrate is conteined in theſe words, *Be thou a faithfull diſpenſer of the word of God, and Sacraments.* And afterwards, when the Biſhop delivers the holy Bible into the hands of thoſe who are ordeined Prieſts, *Have thou authority to preach the word of God, and Adminiſter the Sacraments.* We do not deny, but Deacons have been admitted to diſtribute and Miniſter the Sacraments, by the Command or permiſſion of Prieſts, or as ſubſervient unto them: but there is as much difference between a ſubſerviēt diſtributiō of the Sacrament, and the *Diſpenſing* or *Adminiſtring* of it, as there is betweene the Office of a Porter who diſtributeth the almes at the gate, and the Office of the Steward who is the proper diſpenſer of it. Looke to it Gentlemen; If your owne Ordination be valide, Ours is as valide, and more pure.

They make the cauſe of theſe defects in our forme of Ordination, to be, becauſe *Zuinglianiſme and Puritaniſme did prevaile in the English Church in thoſe daies. They believed not the reall preſence: therefore they put no word in their forme expreſſing power to conſecrate. They held Epiſcopacy and Prieſthood to be one and the ſame thing: Therefore they put not in one word expreſſing the Epiſcopall Function.* This is called leaping over the ſtile before a man

a man comes at it, To deviſe reaſons of that which never was. Firſt prove our defects, if you can: And then find out as many reaſons of them as you liſt. But to ſay the truth; the cauſe and the effect are well coupled together. The cauſe, that is the Zuinglianiſme of our predeceſſours, never had any reall exiſtence in the nature of things, but onely in theſe mẽs imaginations: So the defects of our Ordinalls are not reall but imaginary. Herein the Fathers adventured to farre, to tell us that we have nothing in our formes of Ordeining, to expreſſe either the Prieſtly or Epiſcopall functiõ: when every child that is able to reade can tell them, that we have the expreſſe words of Bishops and Prieſts in our Formes, over and over againe, And mainteine to all the the world that *the three Orders, of Bishops Prieſts and Deacons, have been ever from the beginning in the Church of Chriſt.*

In præfatione.

This they ſay *is the true reaſon, why Parker and his Collegues were contented with the Nagges head Conſecration,* (that is to ſay, one brainſick whimſey is the reaſon of another): *and why others recurred to extraordinary vocation in Queene Eliſabeths time.* Say what others? name one genuine ſon of the Church of England if you can? Doctor *Whitakers*, and Doctor *Fulke*, who are the onely two men

men mentioned by you, are both profeſſedly againſt you. Doctor *Whitakers* ſaith *we do not condemne all the Order of Bishops, as he falſely ſlanders us, but onely the falſe Bishops of the Church of Rome.* And Doctor Fulke, *for Order and ſeemely goverment among the Clergy, there was allwaies one Principall, to whom the name of Bishop or Superintendent hath been applied, which roome* Titus *exerciſed in* Crete, Timothy *in* Epheſus, *others in other Places.* Adding, that *the Ordination, or Conſecration, by impoſition of hands, was alwaies principally committed to him.*

De Eccleſ. cont. 2. q. 5 c. 3

In Titum c. 1

The Fathers proceed, *If Mr.* Lawd *had found ſucceſſe in his firſt attempts, it is very credible, he would in time have reformed the Forme of the English Ordination.* That pious and learned Prelate wanted not other degrees in Church and Schooles, which they omit. He was a great lover of peace, but too judicious to dance after their pipe, too much verſed in Antiquity to admit their new matter and forme, or to attempt to correct the *Magnificat* for ſatisfaction of their humours. But whence had they this credible Relation? We are very confident, they have neither Authour nor ground for it, but their owne imagination. And if it be ſo, what excuſe they have for it in their Caſe Divinity, they know beſt: but in ours we could not excuſe it from down right calumny.

They

They have ſuch an eye at our order and uniformity, that they can not let our *long Cloakes and Surpleſſes* alone. We never had any ſuch animoſities among us about our Cloakes, as ſome of their Religious Orders have had about their gownes: both for the colour of them, whether they ſhould be black, or white, or gray, or the naturall Colour of the ſheep; And for the faſhion them, whether they ſhould belong or ſhort &c, in ſo much as two Popes ſucceſſively could not determine it.

If Mr. *Maſon* did commend the wiſedome of the English Church, for paring away ſuperfluous Ceremonies in Ordination, he did well. Ceremonies are advancements of Order, decency, modeſty, and gravity in the ſervice of God, Expreſſions of thoſe heavenly deſires and diſpoſitions, which we ought to bring along with us to Gods houſe, Adjuments of attention and devotion, Furtherances of Edification, viſible inſtructers, helps of Memory, exercciſes of faith, the ſhell that preſerves the Kernell of Religion from contempt, the leaves that defend the bloſſomes and the fruite; but if they grow over thick and ranke, they hinder the fruite from comming to maturity, and then the Gardiner pluckes them of. There is great difference be-

tween

ween the hearty expreſſions of a faithfull friend, and the mimicall geſtures of a fawning flatterer: betweē the unaffected comeneſſe of a grave Matrone, and the phantaſticall paintings, and patchings, and powderings, of a garish Curteſan.

When Ceremonies become burthenſome by exceſſive ſuperfluity, or unlawfull Ceremonies are obtruded, or the Subſtance of divine worship is placed in Circumſtances, or the ſervice of God is more reſpected for humane ornaments then for the Divine Ordinance; it is high time to pare away exceſſes, and reduce things to the ancient meane.

Theſe Fathers are quite out, where they make it lawfull at ſome times to adde, but never to pare away: yet we have pared away nothing, which is either preſcribed or practiſed by the true Catholick Church. If our Anceſtors have pared away any ſuch things out of any miſtake, (which we do not beleeve,) let it be made appeare evidently to us, and we are more ready to welcome it againe at the foredore, then our Anceſtours were to caſt it out at the backdore. *Errare poſſumus hæretici eſſe nolumus.*

To conclude, as an impetuous wind doth not blow downe thoſe trees which are well radicated

radicated, but causeth them to spread the
rootes more firmely in the earth: so the
concussions of our Adversaries, do confirm
us in the undoubted assurance of the truth
and validity, and legality of our holy Or-
ders. We have no more reason to doubt
the truth of our Orders, because of the dif-
ferent judgment of an handfull of our par-
tiall countrymen, and some few forrein
Doctors misinformed by them: then the
themselves have to doubt of the truth of
their Orders who were ordeined by *For-
mosus*, because two Popes *Stephen* and *Ser-
gius* one after another, out of passion and
prejudice, declared them to be voide and
invalide.

But supposing that which we can never
grant, without betraying both our sel-
ves and the truth, that there were some
remote probabilities, that might occasion
suspicion in some persons prepossessed with
prejudice, of the legality of our Orders;
yet for any man upon such pretended un-
certeinties, to leave the communion of
that Church wherein he was baptised,
which gave him his Christian being,
and to Apostate to them, where he shall
meet with much greater grounds of feare,
both of Schisme and Idolatry; were to plõge
himself in a certein crime, for feare of
an

uncertein danger.

Here the Fathers make a briefe repeti-
on of whatſoever they have ſaid before in
is diſcourſe, (either out of diſtruſt of the
eaders memory, or confidence of their
wne atchievements,) of the *Nagges head*,
d *Mr. Neale*, and the Proteſtant writers,
d Bishop *Brancroft*, and Bishop *Morton*
d the other Bishops that ſate with him
e laſt Parliament, (which being the onely
ing alleged by them in the Authours life
me, and proved ſo undeniably to be falſe,
enough to condemne all the reſt of their
learſay reports, for groundleſſe fables) of
r Regiſters, of King *Edwards* Bishops, of
ishop *Barlow*, and of the forme of our ordi-
ation; Directing him who will cleare all
oſe doubtes, what he hath to do, as if we
ere their Iournymen. Let them not trou-
le themſelves about that, they are cleared
the leaſt graine.

But if they will receive adviſe for adviſe,
nd purſue a prudentiall courſe which they
reſcribe to others; if they regard the pre-
nt face of the skie, and looke well to their
wne intereſt, and the preſent conjuncture
f their affaires: they have more need and
re more ingaged in reputation to defend
hemſelves, then to oppugne others.

So they conclude their diſcourſe with
this

this short Corollary, *How unfortunately* [illegible] *Charles the first late King of England, mis*[illegible] *formed in matter of his Bishops and Clergy* [illegible] *what scruple could he have had, if he had kn*[illegible] *the truth, to give way to the Parliament, t*[illegible] *pull downe Parliament Bishops, who were s*[illegible] *farre from being* de jure divino, *that they we*[illegible] *not so much as* de jure Ecclesiastico? W[illegible] thanke you Gentlemen for your good will. The Orthodox Clergy of *England* are you[illegible] feare. And you know what commonly followeth after feare, Hate, *Oderunt qu*[illegible] *metuunt*. What pitty it is that you were no[illegible] of King *Charles* his Councell, to have ad[illegible] vised him better? yet we observe few Princes thrive worse, then where you pretend to be great ministers. If you had counsailed him upon this Subject, perhaps you might have found him too hard for you, as another did whose heart he burst with downe right reason. If ever that innocent King had a finger in the blood of any of that party, that was it, to choake a man with reason: but certeinly that wise Prince would not have much regarded your positive conclusions, upon hearsay premisses.

We hold our Benefices by human right, our offices of Priests and Bishops both by divine right and humane right. But put the case we did hold our Bishopricks onely by

humane right, Is it one of your caſes of ſcience, that a Soveraigne prince may ly take away from his Subjects any ng which they hold by humane right? one man take from another that which holdes juſtly by the law of man, he is a efe and a robber by the law of God. Let alter the caſe a little, from our Bisho-ckes totheirColleges or their treaſures: any man ſhould attempt to take them om them, upon this ground becauſe they ld them but by humane right, they would ickly crie out with *Ploiden*, *the caſe is ered.* Be our right divine, or humane, both, if we be not able to defend it ainſt any thing the Fathers can bring ainſt it, we deſerve to loſe it.

FINIS.